



# AN INTRODUCTION TO CLASSICAL SANSKRIT

AN INTRODUCTORY TREATISE OF THE HISTORY OF  
CLASSICAL SANSKRIT LITERATURE

BY

GAURINATH BHATTACHARYYA SHASTRI MA

Premchand Roychand Student Lecturer in Sanskrit at the  
Presidency College and at the University of Calcutta

MODERN BOOK AGENCY

10 College Square Calcutta —

1943

Published by  
U C Bhattacharyya,  
10, College Square, Calcutta

ed by A N Mukherjee,  
M I PRESS,  
Ghev Street, Calcutta

To the sacred memory of  
my parents



## PREFACE

The impetus to the writing of the present work came from my students at the Presidency College Calcutta. The paucity of suitable text books on the subject intended for Degree and Post Graduate students of Indian Universities was felt by myself in my college life and in writing this book I have always borne in mind the difficulties which our student feel in tackling the subject. The work therefore does not pretend to be very ambitious.

In the preparation of the book I have freely consulted the two monumental works of M Winternitz and A B Keith. To them therefore I am under a deep debt of gratitude. I must also acknowledge my indebtedness to all those authorities whose works have been mentioned in the References.

In preparing the press copy my pupil Professor Sarjendra Nath Bhattacharya Sahityaśāstri Kavyalūratīrtha M A has rendered invaluable service. Another pupil of mine Mr Tarakanath Choudhary M A has prepared the major part of the Index. My ex-colleagues Professor Upendranath Choudhary M A Ph D and Professor Subodhchandra Sengupta M A P R S Ph D had the kindness the former to find out for me a few references and the latter to read a considerable portion of the work while in the press. My teachers Mahāmahopādhyāya Harachandra Shastri Professor Sadananda Bhaduri M A Ph D and Professor Somnath Maitra M A have helped me much by offering valuable suggestions from time to time. I must also acknowledge the advice given so freely by my friend and colleague Professor Tarakanath Sen M A. Lastly I must mention the deep interest which was taken by my cousin Pandit Ashokanath Shastri Vedāntatīrtha M A P R S in seeing the work through.

The occasion makes me remember with deep and reverent

gratitude, those of my teachers at whose feet I had the privilege of studying the subject—the late Professor Rakhaldas Banerjee, M A, of the Benares Hindu University, and Professor Nilmony Chakravarty, M A, late Senior Professor of Sanskrit, Presidency College, Calcutta

I am thankful to my publishers, the Modern Book Agency, Calcutta, and to the authorities of the M. I Press, Calcutta, for the kind interest they have taken in the printing and publication of my book

Calcutta,

**Author**

January, 1943

# ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
<b>Introductory</b>	1—22
Origin of Indian writing—Vedic and Classical Indian languages their relationship—Prakrit —Was Sanskrit a spoken language ?	
<b>Chapter One    The Great Epics</b>	23—37
Rāmāyana    Origin and story—Character—Spurious element—Antiquity—Relation to Buddhism— Greek influence—Allegorical interpretation— Mythological interpretation	
Mahābhārata    General character and story—Gitā— Three stages—Age—Literary and inscrip- tional evidence—Which of the two Epics is earlier ?	
<b>Chapter Two    The Purāṇas</b>	38—43
Introduction—Age and antiquity—Character and value—Name and number of Purāṇas— Devīmāhātmya—Name and number of Upapurāṇas	
<b>Chapter Three    The Tantras</b>	44—47
Meaning contents and classification—Relation to Vedic literature—Antiquity—Home—Works	
<b>Chapter Four    Kāvya in inscriptions</b>	48—50
Renaissance Theory of Max Muller—Girnar and Nisik inscriptions—Conclusions	
<b>Chapter Five    Early Buddhist works in Sanskrit</b>	51—74
Introduction—Works belonging to Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna schools (i) Poetical (ii) Philoso- phical (iii) Avadāna	





	PAGES
<b>Chapter Seventeen</b> Politics	180—181
Introduction—Works on Politics	
<b>Chapter Eighteen</b> Frotics	182—183
Introduction—Works on Frotics	
<b>Chapter Nineteen</b> Medicine	184—186
History of medical literature—Earlier and later medical works	
<b>Chapter Twenty</b> Astronomy    Mathematics and Astrology	187—191
History of Astronomy—Works on Astronomy—Works on Mathematics—Works on Astrology	
<b>Chapter Twenty One</b> Miscellaneous Sciences	192—194
Archery—Sciences of elephants and horses—Sciences of jewels sterling cooking music dancing and painting	
<b>Chapter Twenty Two</b> Philosophy	195—237
Orthodox systems    Nyāya    Vaiśeṣika    Sāṃkhya    Yoga    Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta—Heterodox systems    Buddhism    Jainism and Materialism—Miscellaneous works on philosophy	
<b>Appendix</b> History of the Study of Sanskrit in the West	1—15

## ABBREVIATIONS

ABORI	Annals of the Bharu- dakar Oriental Re- search Institute	KL	<i>Kaṇṇaṭṭaṇṭa</i>
1st	<i>1stādhyāyī</i>	KS	<i>Kaṇṇa āṭṭa</i>
Har	<i>Harśaśarita</i>	MB	<i>Maṭṭhaṇṭa</i>
IOS	Harvard Oriental Series	Mbh	<i>Mahābhārata</i>
IA	Indian Antiquary	Nr	<i>Narāṭṭa</i>
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society	Raṇ	<i>Raṇṇaṇṭa</i>
<i>Kāḍ</i>	<i>Kāḍambarī</i> (M R Kale 2nd edition)	Rām	<i>Rāmāṇṭa</i>
		Rv	<i>Ravāṭa</i>
		SBE	Sacred Books of the East, Oxford
		SD	<i>Saṅgīyadārpṇa</i>
		SI	<i>Śiṣupālāṭṭa</i>
		Vās	<i>Vāsāṭṭa</i>

## ERRATA

Pp 119 &c	Line 1	For 'Chapter Six' read 'Chapter Eight' and emend all subsequent chapter numberings accordingly
P 193	Line 13	For 'Sanmukhaḥkalpa' read 'Sanmukhaḥkalpa'

# AN INTRODUCTION TO CLASSICAL SANSKRIT

## INTRODUCTORY

### A

#### ORIGIN OF INDIAN WRITING

The immemorial practice with students of Sanskrit literature has been to commit to memory the various subjects of their study, and this practice of oral tradition has preserved the ancient Vedic texts. This fact has led scholars to surmise that writing was perchance unknown in the earliest period of Indian civilization and that the later forms of the alphabet were not of pure Indian growth.

Introduc-  
tion

The earliest references to writing in Sanskrit literature are to be found in the *Dharmasūtra* of Vasiṣṭha, which, as Dr Bühler thinks was composed about the eighth century B.C. There are, however, some scholars who would like to assign a much later date to the work, viz., the fourth century B.C. There we obtain clear evidence of the widely spread use of writing during the Vedic

Evidence of  
Vedic and  
Sūtra  
works

period, and in Ch XVI 10, 14-15, mention is made of written documents as legal evidence. Further, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini contains such compounds as 'līpikara' and 'lībhikara' which evidently mean 'writer' [III ii 21]. The date of Pāṇini, however is not fixed. Professor Goldstucker wants to place him in the eighth century B C, while the general body of scholars holds that his age is the fourth century B C. In addition to the few references set forth above, it may be said that the later Vedic works contain some technical terms such as 'akṣara,' 'kāṇḍa,' 'pātala,' 'grantha' and the like, which some scholars quote as evidence of the use of writing. But there are others who like to differ in their interpretations of these terms.

The aforesaid references do not help us much in determining the genuine Indian growth of writing, inasmuch as none of the works in which they are found can be safely dated earlier than the period of inscriptions. In the same way, evidences in the Brāhmaṇical works such as the Epics, the Purāṇas, the Kāvya and the like, are of little or no help. Among them, the Epics are by far the oldest, but it is difficult to prove that every word of their text goes back to a high anti-

Evidence of  
Brāhma-  
ṇical works

quity. One fact is however, undeniable, viz that the Epics contain some archaic expressions such as, 'lil h, 'lel ha, lel ha la 'lekhana, but not 'liri, which, as many scholars think, is after all a foreign word. This may suggest that writing was known in India in the Epic age.

There are two other facts which also suggest the same thing. It is believed that the Aryans were in an advanced state of civilization—there was a high development of trade and monetary transactions and that they carried on minute researches in grammar, phonetics and lexicography. Do not the above facts presuppose the knowledge of the art of writing among the ancient Indians? Nevertheless, one will have to adduce positive evidence, without which nothing can be taken for granted. So we turn to the Buddhist works.

Evidence of  
Indian civil-  
ization

There are quite a large number of passages in the Ceylonese *Tipitaka*, which bear witness to an acquaintance with writing and to its extensive use at the time when the Buddhist canon was composed. 'Lekhha and 'lel ha la are mentioned in the *Bhikkhu Pacittiya* 2, 11 and in the *Bhikkhu Pacittiya* 49, 11. In the former, writing has been highly

Evidence of  
Buddhist  
writings

praised In the Jātakas, constant mention is made of letters The Jātakas know of proclamations We are also told of a game named *alṣarīḷā* in which the Buddhist monk is forbidden to participate This game was in all probability one of guessing at letters In the rules of Vinaya, it has been laid down that a criminal, whose name has been written up in the King's porch must not be received into the monastic order In the same work, writing has been mentioned as a lucrative profession Jātaka No 125 and the *Mahāvagga*, I 49 bear witness to the existence of elementary schools where the manner of teaching was the same as in the indigenous schools of modern India All these references prove the existence of the art of writing in pre-Buddhist days

The earliest written record is the Piprāwā vase inscription which was discovered some-time ago by Colonel Claxton Peppe This inscription is written in Brāhmī character and is in a language which does not conform to any of the standard Piākṛits Some of the case-endings tend towards Māgadhi No compound consonant has been written They have been either simplified or divided

by epenthesis. No long vowel, excepting two 'e's, have been used. The inscription has been differently interpreted. According to some scholars the relics that were enshrined were the relics of Buddha while others maintain that the relics were those of the Sakyas who were massacred by Vinulaka son of Prasenajit, King of Kosala. In any case the inscription belongs to the early part of the fifth century B.C.

Next in order of antiquity comes the Sogaura copper plate which, as Dr. Smith thinks, may be dated about half a century prior to Asoka.<sup>1</sup> The characters of the document according to Dr. Smith are those of the Brahmi of the Maurya period and his statements, according to Dr. Bühler, are incontestable as everyone of them is traceable in the Edicts. About the proper import

Sogaura  
Copper  
plate

<sup>1</sup>The English translation of Dr. Bühler's version is given below.

The order of the great officials of Śrīvastī (issued) from (their camp at) Mānavasitikata— These two store houses with three partitions (which are situated) even in famous Vamsagrāma require the storage of loads (bhīraka) of Black Panicum parched grain cummin seed and Amba for (times of) urgent (need). One should not take (anything from the grain stored).  
— IA Vol XXV pp 261—66



of the inscription none is sure. Dr. Smith says that he cannot find out any meaning from it. The value of the inscription rests on the fact that it is an evidence for the assumption that in the third century B.C., the use of writing was common in royal offices and that the knowledge of written characters was widely spread among the people.

Inscriptions  
of Asoka,  
Nahapāna  
and Rudra-  
dāman

The inscriptions of Asoka, are found almost all over India and are written in two different scripts, viz., Brāhmī and Kharosthī. Two of these inscriptions—that of Shāhbāzgarhī and Mānsehrā, are written in the latter. The rest are written in Brāhmī. The language of early Indian inscriptions is not Sanskrit, but vernacular, which is known as Pīṭkṛit. In the inscriptions of Asoka, local varieties are to be found. Those in the north-western part of India incline more towards Paśācī, than those found in the eastern part. It is interesting to note that all the Indian inscriptions from the earliest times down to the second century A.D., are in Pīṭkṛit. The earliest inscription in Sanskrit is the Nāsik Cave No. X inscription of Nahapāna, which was written, in all probability, in the year 41 of the Śaka era, corresponding to 119 A.D. But there

are scholars who do not like to call this inscription the earliest in Sanskrit and in their opinion the well known Junāgadh inscription of Rudradaman dated 150 A.D. heads the list of Sanskrit inscriptions. Sanskrit gradually encroached upon Pāli in the field of epigraphy and it was from the fifth century A.D. that Pāli disappeared from the field of inscription.

As for the history of the two scripts Brāhmī and Kharosthī mentioned above Dr. Bühler thinks that the latter was derived from the Aramæan or Phœnician character used by the clerks of the Persian Empire.

Kharosthī

The north western parts of India came under the Achaemenian or Persian rule about the sixth century B.C. And it is in those parts of India that inscriptions and coins in Kharosthī character have been discovered. Dr. Bühler has taken sufficient pains to show how from some borrowed letters the full alphabet of the Sanskrit language came into being. There are some scholars who have gone so far as to suggest a meaning of the word Kharosthī. Thus it is held that the name Kharosthī has been derived from the shape of letters which generally resemble the lip of an ass. Professor Levi

thinks that the word is derived from the name of the inventor, Khaiostha, an inhabitant of Central Asia

There are several theories regarding the origin of the Brāhmī character. According to Dr Taylor and others, the Brāhmī character was borrowed from a Southern Arab tribe. This theory has not gained any popularity. The theory started by Dr Weber and illustrated by Dr Buhler is generally accepted. Dr Weber was the first man to discover that some of the old Indian letters are practically identical with certain Assyrian letters and several letters in some inscriptions of the ninth and the seventh centuries B C, found in Assyria. About one-third of the *twenty-three* letters of the North Semitic alphabet of that period is identical with the oldest forms of the corresponding Indian letters. Another one-third is somewhat similar, while the rest can with great difficulty be said to correspond to letters of the Indian alphabet. Dr Buhler took advantage of this theory of Dr Weber, and he next proceeded to show that as a result of the prolonged contact between Indian merchants, mostly, Davidans, and Babylonians in the eighth and the seventh centuries B C,

Brāhmī  
South and  
North  
Semitic  
origin

the former availed themselves of the opportunity to bring the Assyrian art of writing over to India, which later on was enlarged to suit the requirements of the Indian people. Nearly a thousand years later this form of writing came to be styled as Brahmi. It has been said that originally the letters were written from right to left as a single coin has been discovered in a place named Iran on which the legend runs from right to left. But as the Brahmans believed the right hand direction to be sacred they changed the direction and began to write from left to right.

According to Professor Rhys Davids the Indian letters were developed neither from the Northern nor from the Southern Semitic alphabet, but from the pre Semitic form current in the Euphrates valley. But this theory is not accepted on the ground that this supposed pre Semitic form of writing has yet to be explored.

**Pre Semitic  
origin**

Sir Alexander Cunningham had wanted to derive each letter from the indigenous hieroglyphic, but his theory was discarded on the ground that no such hieroglyphic could be found in India. But the recent excavations at Mohenjo daro and Harappa

**Hierogly  
phic origin**

have brought to light, an original Indian hieroglyphic, and a further examination of the theory once started by Sir A. Cunningham may be undertaken

## REFERENCES

- Buhler, G. (i) Indian Paleography  
 (ii) The Origin of Brāhmī Alphabet  
 (iii) The origin of the Kharosthi Alphabet (IA Vol XXIV)  
 (iv) Indian Studies III
- Cunningham, A. The Coins of Ancient India
- Cust, R. N. On the origin of the Indian alphabet  
 JRAS Vol XVI (New series)
- Lévi, S. (i) Indian Writing (IA Vol XXXIII)  
 (ii) Kharostia and the Kharostri writing  
 (IA Vol XXXV)
- Mitra, P. New Light from Pre-historic India  
 (IA Vol XLVIII)
- Shamasastri, R. A theory of the origin of the Devanagari alphabet (IA Vol XXXV)
- Taylor, I. The Alphabet
- Thomas, E. Princep's Essays, Vol II

## B

VEDIC AND CLASSICAL INDIAN  
 LANGUAGES—THEIR  
 RELATIONSHIP

Indian tradition knows Sanskrit as the language of the gods, which has been the

dominant language of India for a period covering over four thousand years. Viewed from its rich heritage of literature, its fascinating charm of words, its flexibility of expression in relation to thought Sanskrit occupies a singular place in the literature of the world.

The Sanskrit language is generally divided into Vedic and Classical. In the Vedic language was written the entire sacred literature of the Aryan Indians. Within this Vedic language several stages may be carefully distinguished, and in course of its transition from the one to the other it gradually grew modern till it ultimately merged in Classical Sanskrit. But when we pass on from the Vedic lyrics to the lyrics of Classical Sanskrit we seem to enter a 'new world'. Not only are the grammar, vocabulary, metre and style different, but there is also a marked distinction in respect of matter and spirit. Thus the Classical Sanskrit period is marked by a change of religious outlook and social conditions. Vedic literature is almost entirely religious, but Classical Sanskrit has a profane aspect as well which is not in any way inferior to the religious aspect. The religion in the Epic period has become different from

**Vedic and  
Classical  
difference  
in matter  
and spirit**

what it was in the Vedic age. The Vedic Nature-worship has been superseded by the cult of Brahmanā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, and it is in the Epic period that we find for the first time the incarnations of Viṣṇu who has come to be looked upon as the Supreme Deity. New gods and goddesses unknown to the Vedas have arisen, and Vedic gods have either been forgotten or reduced to a subordinate position. Indra is, indeed, the only god who still maintains high status as the lord of heaven. Vedic literature in its earlier phase was marked by a spirit of robust optimism but Classical Sanskrit literature has a note of pessimism owing probably to the influence of the doctrine of *kaṛman* and transmigration of soul. The naive simplicity of Vedic literature is strikingly absent in Classical Sanskrit where the introduction of the supernatural and the wonderful is full of exaggeration. So kings are described as visiting Indra in heaven and a sage creating a new world by means of his great spiritual powers. The tribal organization of the state has lessened much in importance in the Epic period where we find the rise of many territorial kingdoms.

In respect of form also Classical Sanskrit

differs considerably from Vedic. Thus the four Vedas and the Brahmanas are marked with accents (*udatta, anudatta and svarita*) which only can help us in finding out the meaning of different words. Thus, for instance, the word '*Indriyatu*' with one kind of accent will mean 'Indra's enemy' and the same word with a different kind of accent will imply 'enemy of India'. But in Classical Sanskrit literature, accent has no part to play.

Difference  
in form  
(i) accent

Phonetically Vedic and Classical languages are identical, but grammatically they differ. The change in grammar is not generally due to the introduction of new formations or inflections but to the loss of forms<sup>1</sup>. In respect of mood the difference between Classical and Vedic Sanskrit is specially very great. In the Vedas the present tense has besides its indicative inflection

(i) grammar

<sup>1</sup> Certain grammatical forms which occur in Vedic language disappear in Classical. Thus in declension a number of forms has been dropped — (i) the nominative and accusative dual forms of *-a* stems ending in *-ā* e.g. *narā* (ii) the nominative plural form of *-a* stems ending in *-āsah* e.g. *devāsah* (iii) the instrumental plural form of *-a* stems ending in *-ebhūh* e.g. *devēbhūh* etc.



a subjunctive (requisition), optative (wish) and an imperative (command) The same three moods are found, though with much less frequency, as belonging to the perfect and they are also made from the aorists (*lun*) and the future has no moods In Classical Sanskrit, the present tense adds to its indicative an optative and an imperative But the subjunctive (*let*) is lost in Classical Sanskrit<sup>1</sup> In the Vedic period no less than *fifteen* forms of infinitive were used<sup>2</sup> of which only *one* (*tum*) survives in the Classical period Vedic Sanskrit differs from Classical Sanskrit in respect of the use of prefixes (*upasargas*) Thus in Classical Sanskrit the *upasarga* must invariably precede the root and should form a part of it But the use of *upasargas* was unrestricted in Vedic Sanskrit It was used before the root and after it and was also sometimes separated from the root itself<sup>3</sup> Compounds of more than two words, which are rare in the Vedas and the Brāhmanas, are frequent in Classical Sanskrit

<sup>1</sup> *adya jīvānū, śatam jīvāti śaradāh*, etc., as found in the Veda

<sup>2</sup> *Asi* III iv 9

<sup>3</sup> *ā li śnena rajasū varitamūno*, etc

The aforesaid changes in respect of forms were mainly due to the efforts of grammarians who exercised considerable influence on the development of the language. The vocabulary also underwent many changes. It was largely extended by derivation, composition and compilation. Many old words that could not be found in Vedic literature came to be added in Classical Sanskrit and many new words were borrowed.

(iii) Vocabulary

Vedic language again differs from Classical with regard to the use of metres. Beside the principal seven metres of the Vedas (*gayatrī*, *usūh*, *anustubh*, *bṛhatī*, *pañkti*, *tristubh* and *jagatī*) Classical Sanskrit presents a limitless variety of metres.

(iv) Metre

#### REFERENCES

- Ghate V S      Lectures on the Rgveda  
 Kielhorn F     A Grammar of Sanskrit Language  
 Macdonell A A   (i) A History of Sanskrit Literature  
                       (ii) A Vedic Grammar  
                       (iii) Vedic Mythology  
 Weber A        The History of Indian Literature  
 Whitney W D    A Sanskrit Grammar  
 Williams M     A Practical Grammar of the Sanskrit Language  
 Winternitz M    A History of Indian Literature  
                       Vol I

## C

## PRĀKRIT

Antiquity

The beginnings of the Piākṛits go back to a period of great antiquity. Even at the time when Vedic hymns were composed, there existed a popular language which differed from the literary dialect. In the Vedic hymns, there are several words which cannot be phonetically other than Piākṛit. Buddha and Mahāvīra preached their doctrines in the sixth century B C, in the language of the people in order that all might understand them. The language of the Buddhist texts which were collected during the period between 500 B C and 400 B C, was Māgadhī. The extant Buddhist texts of Ceylon, Burma and Siam are in a form of popular language to which the name Pāli has been given. There is difference of opinion amongst scholars regarding the place and origin of Pāli. The only inscription, the language of which is akin to Pāli, is the Hātī-Gumphā inscription of Khāravela, dated the 160th year of the Maurya era.

Relation of  
Sanskrit  
to Prākṛit

Patañjali says that Sanskrit was a spoken language, but it was confined to the cultured section of the people. The popular dialect

of India was known by the general name of Pākṛit. From the distribution of languages in Sanskrit dramas it appears that the masses while speaking Prākṛit could understand Sanskrit. It has been said in Bhāṭa's *Nāṭyaśāstra* that Prākṛit and Sanskrit are different branches of one and the same language. In the earliest known forms of Prakrit, there are passages which can be easily translated into Sanskrit by the application of simple phonetic rules.

According to European scholars, Pākṛit, which represents the Middle Indian period of the Indo Aryan languages, may again be subdivided into three stages (1) Old Prākṛit or Pālī, (2) Middle Pākṛit, and (3) late Pākṛit or Apabhraṃsa. They would like to say that if Prakrit had been a language derived from Sanskrit, Prakrit would have taken the name Sanskrta. Moreover, there are many words and forms in Prakrit which cannot be traced in Classical Sanskrit. If, however, by the word Sanskrit is included the language of the Vedas and all dialects of the old Indian period, it will be correct to assume that Pākṛit is derived from Sanskrit. But the word Sanskrit is generally used to refer to the Pāṇini Patañjali language.

European  
view

Orthodox  
view

Indian grammarians, however, would say that the name Piākṛit is derived from the word *prākṛti*, which means 'the basic form', viz, Sanskrit. Further, in Piākṛit there are *three* classes of words, e.g, (i) '*tatsama*' words which are identical in form and meaning in both Sanskrit and Piākṛit, e.g, *dava*, *hamala*, (ii) '*tadbhava*' words that are derived from Sanskrit by the application of phonetic rules, e.g, *ajjautta* < *āryaputṛa*, *pancumbra* < *pancumbya*, and (iii) "*desin*" words that are of indigenous origin and the history of which cannot be accurately traced, e.g, *chollanti*, *canga*. A careful examination of Piākṛit vocabulary reveals the fact that the majority of Piākṛit words belong to the second class, words belonging to the other classes are comparatively small in number. The derivatives are in most cases the result of phonetic decay.

Varieties of  
Prākṛit

The following are the more important literary Piākṛits. Mahāiāstī, Śaurasenī, Māgadhi are the dramatic Piākṛits, while Aīdha-Māgadhi, Jaina-Mahāiāstī, Jaina-Śaurasenī are the Piākṛits of the Jaina canon. The last is the Apabhramśa.



special character of Classical Sanskrit as a living speech. Moreover, there are many sūtras in the *Astādhyāyī* of Pāṇini which are meaningless unless they have any reference to a living speech.<sup>1</sup> Yāska, Pāṇini and even Kātyāyana have discussed the peculiarities in the usages of Easterners and Northerners.<sup>2</sup> Local variations are also noticed by Kātyāyana, while Patañjali has collected words occurring in particular districts.<sup>3</sup> Patañjali again tells us that the words of Sanskrit are of ordinary life and describes an anecdote in which a grammarian converses with a charioteer and the discussion is carried on in Sanskrit.<sup>4</sup>

Extent of  
Sanskrit as  
spoken  
language

From all that has been said above, it is clear that Sanskrit was a living speech in ancient India. But the question which still remains to be discussed is whether Sanskrit was the vernacular of all classes of people in the society or of any particular section or sections. Patañjali says that the

<sup>1</sup> *Ast* VIII iv 48, etc. Also *Ganasutras*, Nos 18, 20, 29

<sup>2</sup> *Nm* II ii 8 *Ast* IV i 157 & 160

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Vārttika*, "sarve deśāntare" referred to in the *Paspaśūhmika*, MB

<sup>4</sup> MB under *Ast* II iv 56

the language spoken in the days of Pāṇini could be mastered if it was heard from the learned Brāhmanas of the day (*te it*) who could speak correct Sanskrit without any special tuition<sup>1</sup>. It is gathered from the *Sundarabandha* of the *Tamizār* that the language spoken by the twice born caste was Sanskrit. It is told in the *Kumārata* of Vāṭavya that men of the caste should speak both in Sanskrit and the vernacular of the province and thus means that Sanskrit was not the spoken language of each and every section of the people in the society.<sup>2</sup> Hsün Tsung, the Chinese traveller (seventh century AD) tells us that the language in which official debates were arranged was Sanskrit and not any provincial dialect. The *Pancatantra* informs us that the medium of instruction for the young boys of the ruling class was Sanskrit and not any vernacular.

We may draw from this the conclusion that Sanskrit was the vernacular of the educated people but it was understood in still wider sections. Our conclusions may find support from the evidence of the dramatic literature where we observe

Conclu-  
sions

<sup>1</sup> MB and r 44 VI m 109. <sup>2</sup> I m V xxx 18

<sup>3</sup> AS iv 20



that Brāhmanas, kings and ministers speak Sanskrit while women and all the common people use Pīākṛit, except that nuns and courtesans occasionally converse in Sanskrit. Uneducated Brāhmanas are introduced speaking popular dialects. But it is highly significant that the dialogues between Sanskrit-speaking and Pīākṛit-speaking persons are very frequent and this suggests that in real life Sanskrit was understood by those who would not speak it themselves. This statement may be further corroborated by the fact that common people would gather to hear the recital of the popular Epics in the palaces of kings and in temples, they would not attend such functions unless they could understand the content of the recital.

## REFERENCES

- Bhandarkar, R. G. Wilson Philological Lectures  
(Lecture VII)  
 Keith, A. B. A History of Sanskrit Literature  
 Macdonell, A. A. A History of Sanskrit Literature  
 Pathak, K. B. The Age of Pāṇini and Sanskrit  
 as a spoken language (ABORI  
 Vol. XI)  
 Rapson, E. J. JRAS 1904

# CHAPTER ONE

## THE GREAT EPICS

### A RĀMĀYANA

The Indian tradition makes Vālmiki the author of the *Ramayana*, the first poet (*adikavi*) who is reported to have been deeply moved by the piteous wrilings of the female culew when her husband was killed by the dart of a forester. Vālmiki's feelings found an expression through the medium of metre,<sup>1</sup> and at the bidding of the divine sage Narada who brought messages from Brāhmā he composed the immortal Rām Epic which tells the story of Prince Rām, the dutiful and devoted son of King Daśaratha of Ayodhya, who was banished from his kingdom for fourteen years through the jealousy of his step mother Kaikeyi who secured possession of the throne for her son Bharata. So Rama and Sita, his beloved wife accompanied by the third prince Lakshmana went to the forest. There the adventures of the banished prince Sita's abduction by Ravana King of Lanka, the help given to Rama

Origin  
and story

<sup>1</sup> *Rām* I ii 15. Also cf. *Rag* XIV 70

by Hanumat, a chief of the monkeys, the destruction of Rāvana and his party, the fire-ordeal of Sītā to prove her chastity these and many other incidents have been described in all the glowing colours of poetry

Character

The *Rāmāyana* which is essentially a poetic creation has influenced the thought and poetry of later centuries in course of which new matters were added to the original composition. The work, in its present form and extent, comprises *seven* books and contains 24000 verses approximately. But it must be remembered that the text of the Epic has been preserved in *three* recensions, the West Indian, the Bengal and the Bombay, and curiously enough each recension has almost one third of the verses occurring in neither of the other two. Of the *three*, the Bombay recension is believed to have preserved the oldest form of the Epic, for here we find a large number of archaic expressions which are rare in the Bengal and the West Indian recensions. According to Professor Jacobi, the Rāma-Epic was first composed in the Kośala country on the basis of the ballad poetry recited by the rhapsodists. In course of time there naturally arose differ-

ence in the tradition of the recitations made by professional story-tellers, and this difference adequately explains the variations in the *three* recensions when they had been assuming their definite forms in the different parts of the land

Internal evidence proves almost conclusively that the whole of the *Ramayana* as it is found to day was not written at one time. It is said that of the *seven* books in the *Ramayana*, the last one and portions of the first are interpolations. In the first place, there are numerous passages in the genuine books which either make no reference to the incidents in the first book or contain statements which contradict those to be found in the first book. Secondly, in the first and third cantos of the first book we find two tables of contents, the first of which does not mention the first and the seventh books. Thirdly, the style and language of the first book do not bear comparison with that of the five genuine books (II—VI). Fourthly, the frequent interruption of the narrative in the first and the seventh books and the complete absence of any such interruption in the other five books cannot but suggest that the two books were

Spurious  
element

composed by subsequent poets of less eminence and talent than the author of the genuine books. Lastly, the character of the hero as drawn in the first and the seventh books differs from what we find in the remaining books. Thus in those two books Rāma is not a mortal hero which he is in the other five books, but a divine being worthy of reverence to the nation.

Antiquity

It has been already observed that the original work of Vālmiki assumed different forms as with years rhapsodists introduced into it newer elements. It is, therefore, very difficult, if not absolutely impossible, to fix any specified age for the whole poem. Dr. Winternitz says that the transformation of Rāma from a man to the Universal God through a semi-divine national hero, cannot but take a sufficient length of time. It should be noted, however, that not only the Rāma-legend but the *Rāmāyana* of Vālmiki also was known to the *Mahābhārata* which contains the *Rāmopākhyāna* in the *Vana-parvan*, of course, in a condensed form. On the other hand, the poet or the poets of the *Rāmāyana* nowhere refer to the Bhāratan story. These facts have led scholars like Professor Jacobi to presume a very early

existence of the Rāma Epic<sup>1</sup> though it still remains a disputed point whether it was earlier than the original story of the *Mahābhārata* the passage in the *Vanaparvan* containing the reference to the *Ramayana* being absent in that very early form of the Bharatan Epic Dr Winternitz believes that "if the *Mahābhārata* had on the whole its present form in the 4th Century A D the *Ramayana* must have received its final form at least a century or two earlier."

From a study of Jātaka literature it would appear that the stories of some of the Jātakas naturally remind us of the story of the *Ramayana* though it must be admitted that we seldom observe any literal agreement between the two To cite an instance, the *Dasaratha jataka* relates the story of the *Ramayana* in a different way where Rāma and Sita are described as brother and sister But it is highly significant that while the Jātakas give us innumerable stories of the demon world and the animals

Relation to  
Buddhism

<sup>1</sup> Scholars like Jacobi Schlegel M Williams Jolly and others point out that the *Ramayana* is earlier than the *Mahābhārata* because the burning of widows does not occur in it but it is mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*

they never mention the names of Rāvana and Hanumat and the monkeys. It is not, therefore, improbable that prior to the fourth or the third centuries B C, when the Buddhist *Tīptaka* is believed to have come into existence, the *Rāmāyana* in its Epic form was not available though ballads dealing with Rāma were known to exist. Traces of Buddhism cannot be found in the *Rāmāyana* and the solitary instance where the Buddha is mentioned is believed to be an interpolation<sup>1</sup>. Dr. Weber, however, suggests that the *Rāmāyana* is based on an ancient Buddhist legend of Prince Rāma. He thinks that the hero of the *Rāmāyana*, is essentially a sage in spirit and not merely a hero of war and that in Rāma we observe the glorification of the ideal of Buddhist equanimity. Dr. Winternitz also approves of the idea of explaining the extreme mildness and gentleness of Rāma by 'Buddhistic undercurrents'. But we must say that by thinking in this way Dr. Weber has ignored the fact that a poet like Vālmiki could easily draw his inspiration from his own heritage. Our con-

<sup>1</sup> Lassen on Weber's *Rāmāyana* (IA Vol III)

clusion, therefore, is that there was no direct influence of Buddhism on the *Ramayana*

It is certain that there is no Greek influence on the *Ramayana* as the genuine *Ramayana* betrays no acquaintance with the Greeks. Dr. Weber, however, thinks that the *Ramayana* is based on the Greek legend of Helen and the Trojan war. But an examination of the contents of the *Ramayana* shows that the expression *yavana* occurs twice in the passages of the *Ramayana* which are evidently interpolations.

Greek  
influence

Professor Lassen was the first scholar to give an allegorical interpretation of the *Ramayana*. In his opinion the Epic represented the first attempt of the Aryans to conquer Southern India. According to Dr. Weber it was meant to account for the spread of Aryan civilization to South India and Ceylon.

Allegorical  
interpreta-  
tion of the  
Epic

Professor Jacobi gives us a mythological interpretation and says that there is no allegory in the Epic. Thus he points out that in the *Rgveda*, Sita appears as the field furrow and is called as the goddess of agriculture. In some of the *Grhyasūtras* Sita is the genuine daughter of the plough field and is a wife of Parjanya or Indra. In

Mythologi-  
cal interpre-  
tation



the *Rāmāyana* also Sītā is represented as emerging from the plough-field of Janaka. Rāma can be identified with India and Hanumat with the Maruts, the associates of India in his battle with demons. But we would only add that to read allegory or mythology in a first rate work of art is without any justification.

## REFERENCES

- Davids, R      Buddhist India  
 Hopkins, E W    The Great Epics of India  
 Jacobi, H      Das Rāmāyana  
 Macdonell, A A    A History of Sanskrit Literature  
 Smith, V A      Oxford History of India  
 Weber, A      (i) On the Rāmāyana (IA Vol III)  
                   (ii) The History of Indian Literature  
 Williams, M      Indian Wisdom  
 Winternitz, M    A History of Indian Literature,  
                                  Vol I

## B

### MAHĀBHĀRATA

Dr Winternitz describes the *Mahabha-  
rata* as a whole literature and does not look  
upon it as one poetic production which the  
*Ramayana* essentially is. The nucleus of the  
*Mahabharata* is the great war of eighteen  
days fought between the Kauravas the  
hundred sons of Dhrtarastra and the Pandavas  
the five sons of Pandu. The poet narrates  
all the circumstances leading up to the war.  
In this great Kuruksetra battle were involved  
almost all the kings of India joining either  
of the two parties. The result of this war was  
the total annihilation of the Kauravas and  
their party, and Yudhishthira the head of the  
Pandavas, became the sovereign monarch of  
Hastinapur. But with the progress of years  
new matters and episodes relating to the  
various aspects of human life, social, econo-  
mic, political, moral and religious as also  
fragments of other heroic legends and legends  
containing reference to famous kings, came  
to be added to the aforesaid nucleus and this  
phenomenon probably continued for centuries  
till in the early part of the Christian era the  
Epic gathered its present shape which is said

**General  
character  
and story**

to contain a hundred thousand verses. It is, therefore, that the *Mahābhārata* has been described not only as a heroic poem, but also as a 'repertory of the whole of the bard poetry'. The Epic in its present form is divided into *eighteen* books with a supplement called the *Harivamśa*<sup>1</sup>

The famous *Śrīmad-Bhagavadgītā* is a chapter of the *Bhīsmaparvan* and contains *eighteen* sections. The *Gītā* is a simplification in verse of the crude doctrines in Hindu philosophy and is a book specially meant for the dwellers of the society rather than for one who has renounced it. The book is no doubt one of the finest fruits of Indian philosophy and has gained world-wide recognition in the hands of philosophers. The theme of this book is the advice, given by Śrī-Kṛṣṇa for consoling depressed Arjuna, mainly dwelling on the doctrines of *karman*, *jñāna* and *bhakti*.

It is extremely difficult for us to separate at this distant date the chaff from the real. However, in the first book of the *Mahābhārata* there is a statement that at one time

<sup>1</sup> It is not definitely known whether this division into eighteen books is purely traditional, there being a somewhat different form of division as surmised from the writings of Albēūnī.

the Epic contained 24000 verses while in another context we find that it consisted of 8800 verses. These statements may definitely lead one to conclude that the Epic had undergone *three* principal stages of development before it assumed its present form.

It is impossible to give in one line the exact date of the *Mahabharata*. To determine the date of the *Mahabharata* we should determine the date of every part of this Epic. In the Vedas there is no mention of the incident of the great Kuruksetra battle. In the Brāhminas, however, the holy Kuru field is described as a place of pilgrimage where gods and mortals celebrated big sacrificial feasts. We also find the names of Janamejaya and Bharata in the Brāhminas. So also the name of Pariksit as a ruler of Kuru land is found in the *Atharvaveda*. We find frequent mention of the Kurus and the Pañcālas in the *Yajurveda*. The *Kathala samhita* mentions the name of Dhritrāstra, son of Vicitravirya. In the *Saṁhitasūtra* we find the mention of a war in Kuru land which was fatal for the Kauravas. But the names of the Pandavas do not occur therein. The *Gīhyasūtra* of Āśvalayana gives the names of Bharata and

Age of the  
Epic

*Mahābhārata* in a list of teachers and books Pāṇini gives us the derivation of the words Yudhishthira, Bhīma and Vidma and the accent of the compound *Mahābhārata* Patañjali is the first to make definite allusions to the story of the battle between the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas Although the Buddhist *Tīpīṭaka* does not mention the name of the *Mahābhārata*, the Jātakas betray a slight acquaintance with it

Moreover, it is proved by literary and inscriptional evidence that already about 500 A D, the *Mahābhārata* was no longer an actual Epic but a sacred book and a religious discourse It was on the whole essentially different from the Epic as it is found to-day Kumārilabhatta quotes passages from the *Mahābhārata* and regards it as a Smṛti work Both Subandhu and Bāṇa knew it as a great work of art<sup>1</sup> and Bāṇa alludes to a recital of the *Mahābhārata*<sup>2</sup> It must be admitted on all hands that though an Epic *Mahābhārata* did not exist in the time of the Vedas, single myths, legends and poems included in the *Mahābhārata* reach back to the Vedic period The *Mahābhārata* has also

Literary  
and inscrip-  
tional  
evidence

<sup>1</sup> *Vās* p 37 & *Har* p 2

<sup>2</sup> *Kūd* p 104

drawn many moral narratives and stories of saints from its contemporary 'ascetic poetry'. An Epic *Mahabharata*, however, did not exist in the fourth century B C, and the transformation of the Epic *Mahabharata* into our present compilation probably took place between the fourth century B C and the fourth century A D. In the fourth century A D, the work was available in its present extent, contents and character, though small alterations and additions might have continued even in later centuries.

To the strictly orthodox Indian mind, the *Ramayana* appears to have been composed earlier than the *Mahabharata*. Indians believe that of the two incarnations of the Lord, Rama and Krishna, the former was born earlier. Western critics do not attach any importance to this belief, for it is argued by them that the hero of the genuine portion of the *Ramayana* which is older does not appear as an incarnation but as an ordinary mortal hero.<sup>1</sup> Professor Jacobi

Two Epics  
which is  
earlier?

<sup>1</sup> There are a few passages in the genuine books e.g. the one in Bk VI where Sitā enters into the pyre wherein Rāma is described as a divine being. Critics feel no hesitation in calling such passages interpolations.

also thinks that of the two poems, the *Rāmāyana* is the earlier production, and he bases his theory on the supposition that it is the influence of the *Rāmāyana* which has moulded the *Mahābhārata* into a poetic form<sup>1</sup> Dr Winternitz does not attach any real importance to this theory and criticizes it by saying that the *Mahābhārata*, even in its present form, retains several characteristics of older poetry while the poem of Vālmiki reveals such peculiarities as would place him nearer to the age of Court-epics Thus it has been pointed out that such expressions like "Bhisma spake" "Sañjaya spake" which the poet of the *Mahābhārata*, uses to introduce a character, are reminiscent of ancient ballad poetry<sup>2</sup> But in the *Rāmāyana* the speeches are introduced in verses and therefore in a more polished form The theory of Professor Jacobi may be further contested on the ground that

<sup>1</sup> According to Mr Hopkins, the *Rāmāyana* as an art-product is later than the *Mahābhārata* (Cf Cambridge History, I p 251)

<sup>2</sup> The mixture of prose with poetry which we notice in the *Mahābhārata* is a fact that proves its antiquity This view of Professor Oldenberg is not accepted by Dr Winternitz

from a perusal of the two Epics, the reader will unmistakably carry the impression that while the *Mahabharata* describes a more warlike age the *Ramayana* depicts a comparatively refined civilization

## REFERENCES

- Bhandarkar R G    On the Mahābhārata (IA  
Vol I)  
Goldstucker T    The Mahābhārata  
Hopkins E W    The Great Epics of India  
Macdonell A A    A History of Sanskrit Literature  
Telang K T    SBE Vol VIII  
Vaidya C V    Mahābhārata a critical study  
Weber A    The History of Indian Literature  
Williams M    Indian Wisdom  
Winternitz M    A History of Indian Literature  
Vol I



## CHAPTER TWO

### THE PURĀNAS

Introduc-  
tion

The origin of the Purāṇas must be traced to that time of religious revolution when Buddhism was gaining ground as a formidable foe of Brāhmanic culture. Great devotees of Brāhmanic religion were anxious for the preservation of the old relics of Hindu culture, and Vyāsa, the great compiler, the greatest man of his time, was born to meet the demand of the age. The most important point to be remembered in this connection, is that the entire Vedic culture lies at the back-ground of the age of Buddhism and the Purāṇas.

Age

It was at one time believed by European scholars that not one of the *eighteen* Purāṇas is earlier than the eleventh century A D. But this belief has been discarded on the discovery of a manuscript of the *Skandapurāṇa* in Nepal written in the sixth century A D. Further, Bāṇabhatta in his *Harśacarita* mentions that he once attended a recitation of the *Vāyupurāṇa*. Kumāṇila (750 A D) regards the Purāṇas as the sources of law. Śaṅkara (ninth century A D) and Rāmānuja (eleventh century A D) refer to the Purāṇas

as sacred texts for their dependence on the Vedas. The famous traveller Alberūnī (1030 A.D.) also gives us a list of the *eighteen Purāṇas*.

The word *Purāṇa* means 'old narrative'. In the *Brāhmanas*, the *Upaniṣads* and the Buddhist texts, the word is found to be used in connection with *Itihāsa*. Some scholars hold that the *Purāṇas* mentioned in these places do not refer to the works we have before us. But the references found in the *Dharmasūtras* of Gautama and Āpastamba (works belonging in all probability to the fifth or the fourth century B.C.) suggest that there were at that early period works resembling our *Purāṇas*. The close relation ship between the *Mahabharata* and the *Purāṇas* is another point in support of the antiquity of the latter. The *Mahabharata* which calls itself a *Purāṇa*, has the general character of the latter, and it is not highly improbable that some integral parts of the *Purāṇas* are older than the present redaction of the *Mahabharata*. The *Lalitavistara* not only calls itself a *Purāṇa* but has also much in common with the *Purāṇas*. The *Vaṃśavāṇana* is quoted literally by the *Harivaṃśa*. The genealogical survey of all the *Purāṇas* reveals

Antiquity

the fact that they generally stop with the accounts of the Āndhra Bhṛtya and Gupta kings and that later kings like Harsa are not mentioned. So it may be suggested that the Purāṇas were written during the rule of the Gupta kings. On the other hand, the striking resemblance between the Buddhist Mahāyāna texts of the first century A.D., and the Purāṇas, suggests the fact that the latter were written early in the beginnings of the Christian era. The characteristics of the Purāṇas are also found in books like the *Saddharmapundarikā* and the *Mahāvastu*. Dr. Winternitz has, however, concluded that the earlier Purāṇas must have come into being before the seventh century A.D.

Character

According to Indian tradition every Purāṇa should discuss *five* topics; (i) *saṃga* creation, (ii) *pratisaṃga* the periodical annihilation and renewal of the world, (iii) *vamśa* genealogy of gods and sages, (iv) *manvantara* the Manu-periods of time i.e., the great periods each of which has a Manu (primal ancestor of the human race) as its ruler, and (v) *vamśānucarita* the history of the dynasties the origin of which is traced to the Sun and the Moon. But all these *five* characteristics are not present in

every Purāṇa, and though in some they are partially present, we notice a wide diversity of topics in them. Thus we find many chapters dealing with the duties of the four castes and of the four *āśramas*, sections on Brāhmanical rites, on particular ceremonies and feasts and frequently also chapters on Sāṅkhya and Yoga philosophy. But the most striking peculiarity of all the Purāṇas is their sectarian character as they are dedicated to the cult of some deity who is treated as the principal God in the book. So we come across a Purāṇa dedicated to Viṣṇu another to Śiva and so on.

Unique is the importance of the Purāṇas from the standpoint of history and religion. The genealogical survey of the Purāṇas is immensely helpful for the study of political history in ancient India, and yet it is a task for the scholar to glean germs of Indian history, hidden in the Purāṇas. Dr. Smith says that the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* gives us invaluable informations about the Maurya dynasty. The *Matsyapurāṇa* is most dependable in so far as the Andhra dynasty is concerned, while the *Vaiṣṇavapurāṇa* gives us detailed descriptions about the reign of Candragupta I. As the object of the Purāṇas was to popularize

Value

the more difficult and highly philosophical preaching of the Vedas through the medium of historical facts and tales, we naturally find in them Hinduism in a fully developed form. So the student of religion cannot pass it by. The Purāṇas are not also wanting in literary merit, and they abound in numerous passages which speak of the highly artistic talent of their makers.

Name and  
number

The Purāṇas or the Mahā-purāṇas, as we have them to-day, are *eighteen* in number, and there are also minor Purāṇas (Upapurāṇas) which all again number *eighteen*. The *eighteen* Mahā-purāṇas are

(1) *Brahma*, (2) *Padma*, (3) *Viṣṇu*, (4) *Śiva*, (5) *Bhāgavata*, (6) *Nārada*, (7) *Mārkandeya*, (8) *Agni*, (9) *Bhaviṣya* or *Bhaviṣyat*, (10) *Brahmavaivarta*, (11) *Linga*, (12) *Varāha*, (13) *Skanda*, (14) *Vāmana*, (15) *Kūrma*, (16) *Matsya*, (17) *Garuda* and (18) *Brahmānda*.

Devīmāhāt-  
mya

The *Devīmāhātmya* which is popularly known as the '*Candī*' or the '*Saptaśatī*', is a section of the *Mārkandeyapurāṇa*. According to Dr. Winternitz, its date is not later than the sixth century A.D. The book which contains *thirteen* chapters and *seven hundred* mantras, is a glorification of the Pūmal

Incarnation (17th Skandha) who descends among all over the earth from time to time to rid the worlds of their evilness and till them the path of dharma. Madhukandha, Madhukavya Samudha and Nandakandha are other. The book is a critical study of religious function of the Hindu.

The eighteen Upapuranas which have been told by different names are —

(1) *Skand purana* (2) *Narayana* (3) *Tajana* (4) *Sattvata* (5) *Harivamsha* (6) *Narada* (7) the two *Nandakavyas* (8) *Umasa* (9) *Kajika* (10) *Varaha* (11) *Sandhya* (12) *Kalika* (13) *Malakandha* (14) *Kallika* (15) *Dev* (16) *Prasara* (17) *Harivamsha* and (18) *Phalata* or *Sarga*.<sup>1</sup>

am. &  
number of  
Upa-  
puranas

#### REFERENCES

Bhandarkar R. G. — *A Study in the Early History of India* (BHASA VIVAKSA 1909)

Farmer H. J. — *EPH. VIVAKSA* 1918

Farmer H. J. — *Cultural History of India*

Valton H. H. — *Essays on Sanskrit Literature*

Winemitz M. — *A History of Indian Literature* Vol. I

<sup>1</sup> The above list of Upapuranas given by Bhandarkar is taken from the *Sattvata Purana*. He himself gives a different list.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THE TANTRAS

Meaning,  
contents  
and class-  
fication

The expression *Tantia* which is a generic name for works belonging to 'Āgama', 'Tantia' and 'Saṃhitā', refers to theological treatises discussing the codes of discipline and worship among different sects of religion along with their metaphysical and mystical points of view. A complete *Tantia* generally consists of four parts, the themes treated of being (i) knowledge (*jñāna*), (ii) meditation (*yoṅa*), (iii) action (*kriyā*) and (iv) conduct (*cariyā*). Though it is not possible to draw any special line of demarcation among Āgama, *Tantia* and *Saṃhitā*, still it is usual to refer to the sacred books of the Śaivas by the expression Āgama, while *Tantia* stands for the sacred literature of the Śāktas and *Saṃhitā* for that of the Vaiṣnavas. The Śākta-*Tantias* are mainly monistic in character, while the Vaiṣnava-*Tantias* generally advocate dualism, or qualified monism. The Śaiva-*Tantias* are divided into three schools of monism, qualified monism and dualism.

The *Tantias* came to replace the Vedas

when in later times it was found that performance of a sacrifice according to Vedic rites was practically impossible owing to their rigid orthodoxy. Thus the Tantras prescribe easier and less complicated methods which would suit not only the higher classes but also the Sūdras and the feminine folk of the society who had no access to Vedic ceremonies. It would therefore not be wise to think that Tantric literature is opposed to Vedic literature, and this point would be made abundantly clear when it is found that the rigidly orthodox Vedic scholars write original works and commentaries on Tantras.

Relation to  
Vedic  
literature

The earliest manuscripts of Tantras date from the seventh to the ninth century A.D., and it is probable that the literature dates back to the fifth or the sixth century A.D., if not earlier. We do not find any reference to a Tantra in the *Mahabharata*. The Chinese pilgrims also do not mention it. It is indeed certain that Tantric doctrine penetrated into Buddhism in the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. The worship of Durgā may be traced back even to the Vedic period.

Antiquity

The home of Āgamic literature seems to be Kāśmīr, while that of Tāntmic literature is Bengal. Smṛitī literature

Home



as it is known, originated in different parts of India, in Bengal, South India and the Siamese country

Works on  
Āgama

Among works belonging to Āgamic literature of Kāshmir the most important are the following

*Mālinīvijaya*, *Śvacchanda*, *Vijñānabhairava*, *Ucchusmabhairava*, *Ānandabhairava*, *Mrgendīa*, *Matanga*, *Netra*, *Narāyaṇa*, *Srāyambhura* and *Rudrayāmala*

Works on  
Pratyabhijñā

Closely associated with Āgamic literature is Pratyabhijñā literature. Some of the most important works of this literature are .

*Śivadīpti* of Somānanda (850-900 A D) *Pratyabhijñākārikās* of Utpala (900-950 A D) *Mālinīvijayottarārūṭṭika*, *Pratyabhijñāumaiśinī*, *Tantrāloka*, *Tantrasāra* and *Paramārthasāra* of Abhinavagupta (993-1015 A D) and *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* of Kṣemarāja (pupil of Abhinavagupta)

Works on  
Saṃhitā

Among works belonging to Saṃhitā literature the most important is the *Ahī-budhnyasamhitā* which was composed in Kāshmir in the fifth century A D. *Īśvara-samhitā*, *Paushkarasamhitā*, *Paramasamhitā*, *Sāttvatasamhitā*, *Bṛhadbrahmasamhitā* and *Jñānāmrtasārasamhitā* are other well-known works of this branch of Sanskrit literature

Among works belonging to Tantra literature, mention may be made of the following — Works on  
Tantra

*Mahānirvāṇa*, *Kulārṇava*, *Kulacudamāṇi*, *Prapañcasara* (of Saṅkha), *Tāntiraśa*, *Kōlivilāsa*, *Jñānārṇava*, *Saradatilaka*, *Varaṇasyaśaṅkṣa* (of Bhaskara), *Tantrasara* (of Kṛṣṇananda) and *Pranatosini*

#### REFERENCES

- |               |   |
|---------------|---|
| Avalon A      | Tantrik Texts                           |
| Chatterji J C | Kashmir Shaivism                        |
| Winternitz M  | A History of Indian Literature<br>Vol I |

## CHAPTER FOUR

### KĀVYA IN INSCRIPTIONS

Renaissance  
theory

Early in the beginnings of Sanskritic studies in Europe, Professor Max Muller propounded the theory of the 'Renaissance of Sanskrit literature', which remained highly popular for a considerable length of time. This theory, set forth with much profundity, sought to establish that Brāhmanic culture passed through its dark age at the time when India was continuously facing foreign invasions. The earliest revival of this culture is to be found in the reign of the Guptas which is a golden page in the annals of Indian culture. In spite of all its ingenuity the theory has been generally discarded by recent researches and discovery. Evidences are now at our disposal to prove the falsity of the assumption and the inscriptions of the early centuries of the Christian era unmistakably show that the study and development of Sanskrit Kāvya was never impeded.

Girnār  
inscription

Thus the inscription of Rudradāman at Girnār dated 150 A.D., is written in prose in the full-fledged Kāvya style with conformity to the rules of grammar.

Though traces of epic licence can be found in the inscription, still the writer is a gifted master in the use of figures of speech. As an example of alliteration may be cited the phrase *abhyastanamno Rudradamno*. Though there are long compounds still the clearness and the lucidity of the style is nowhere forsaken. What is more significant is that the author is conversant with the science of poetics and discusses the merits attributed by Dandin to the Vaidarbha style.

Still another inscription which is derivable from a record of Śrī Puṣumāyī at Nāsik is written in Prakrit prose. The date of this inscription is not far removed from the former. The author who is undoubtedly familiar with Sanskrit, uses enormous sentences with long compounds. Alliterations and even mannerisms of later Kāvya are found in this inscription.

Nāsik  
inscription

It may be therefore concluded that the works of Asvaghosa, the great Buddhist poet, are not the earliest specimens of Sanskrit Kāvya. Either these earlier Kāvya are now lost to us unfortunately, or authors like Kālidāsa have completely eclipsed the glory of their predecessors. Thus of the three

Conclu-  
sions

dramatists referred to by Kālidāsa, the dramas of only one are now known to us

#### REFERENCES

- Keith, A B    A History of Sanskrit Literature  
Macdonell, A A    A History of Sanskrit Literature  
Müller, Max    A History of Ancient Sanskrit  
Literature

## CHAPTER FIVE

### EARLY BUDDHIST WORKS IN SANSKRIT

The paucity of authentic landmarks in the domain of early Indian history is a stupendous stumbling block to the gateway to the study of the history of Sanskrit literature. A colossal darkness that envelops the period of Sanskrit literature in the beginnings of the Christian era, makes it extremely difficult if not hopelessly impossible, to ascertain the age in which a particular writer lived and wrote his work. The chronology of Indian literature is shrouded in such painful obscurity that oriental scholars were long ignorant of the vast literature produced in Sanskrit, by Buddhist writers.

Introduction

The thought of the Mahāyāna school of Buddhism was expressed in a language which was not Pāli the extraordinarily rich and extensive religious literature of Ceylon and Burma, but which was partly Sanskrit and partly a dialect to which Professor Senart has given the designation Mid Sanskrit, or which Professor Pischel likes to call the Gāthā

Buddhist  
Sanskrit  
literature  
includes  
Mahāyāna  
and Hīna  
yāna works

dialect<sup>1</sup> This literature of the Mahāyāna school is called Buddhist Sanskrit literature But it should be mentioned in this connection that Buddhist Sanskrit literature is not synonymous with the rich literature of the Mahāyāna school alone, but it has a still wider scope including as it does the literature of the Hīnayāna school as well, inasmuch as the Saivastivādins, a sect of the Hīnayāna school, possess a canon and a fairly vast literature in Sanskrit The Sanskrit canon, however, is not available in its entirety, but its existence is proved on the evidence of the several quotations from it in such works as the *Mahāvastu*, the *Divyāvadāna* and the *Lalitavistara* This Sanskrit canon shows close affinity to the Pāli canon, and it is suggested that both of them are but translations of some original canon in Māgadhi, which is lost to us

Mahāvastu  
its date

The most important work of the Hīnayāna school is the *Mahāvastu*, the book of the Great Events This *Mahāvastu*, a book belonging to the school of the Loko-

<sup>1</sup>It may be observed in this connection that the Nāsik Cave inscription No X of Nahapāna is written in this dialect

ttaravādins a sub division of the Mahasanghikas, shows after the introduction the following title *Āyamaḥasāṅghīlānam Lokottaravādinam madhyadesīlānam pāṭhena vinayapīṭakasya mahāvastu adī*. This may furnish us with a clue to determine the date of its composition. In order to ascertain this it is to be found out when the Lokottaravādin sect of the Mahasanghikas sprang up. In this connexion, it would be necessary to fix the date of Buddha's death. Scholars are divided in their opinions as to the exact year when Buddha died. Professors Max Muller and Cunningham make it 477 B.C. while Mr. Gopala Aiyer likes to fix it at 483 B.C. But more probable is Dr. Smith's theory according to which Buddha died in 487 B.C. It is said that Asoka was coronated in 269 B.C. and that this coronation took place some two hundred and eighteen years after the death of Buddha. But if the account of the Southern Buddhists is to be believed this year was either 544 or 543 B.C. Now the opening lines of the fifth chapter of the *Mahāvamsa* will throw light on the age when the Mahasanghikas came into being<sup>1</sup>. There it is

<sup>1</sup> *Ēko va theravādo so ādivassasate abhū | aññī*



stated that during the first century after the death of Buddha, there was but one schism among the Theras. Subsequent to this period, other schisms took place among the preceptors. From the whole of those sinful priests, in number ten thousand, who had been degraded by the Theras (who had held the second convocation) originated the schism among the preceptors called the Mahāsāṅghika heresy. It is described in this connexion that as many as eighteen schisms rose and all of them in the course of a couple of centuries after the death of Buddha. But, the difficulty is that there is no mention of the Lokottaravādins in the *Mahāvamsa*. In the appendix of the translation of the *Mahāvamsa*, it has been said that the Lokottaravādins do not appear in the tradition of the Southern Buddhists. They are mentioned immediately beside the Gokulikas. In Rock hill 182, the Lokottaravādins are to be found

caṇḍiavādā tu tato oram ajāyisum || Tehi saṅgītikā-  
 rehi therehi dutiyehi te | niggaḥitā pāpabhikkhū sabbe  
 dasasahassikā || Akams'ācāṇiavādā Mahāsāṅghika-  
 nāmakam ||

just in the place where the Gokulikas are expected. Moreover, in two other contexts the Gokulikas and not the Lokottaravādins are mentioned. Thus, it is better to identify the two and in that case, the Lokottaravādins seem to have sprung up at least in the third century B.C. That being so, the *Mahāvastu* which has been described to be the first work of their sect, could not have been written later than that period.

But a fresh difficulty makes its appearance. The *Mahāvastu* is not a composite whole. Different parts of it have been composed at different periods and this accounts for the unmethodical arrangement of facts and ideas in the work. Besides, the *Mahāvastu* is not a piece of artistic literature. It has rightly been called 'a labyrinth in which we can only with an effort, discover the thread of a coherent account of the life of Buddha'. The contents are not in the least properly arranged and the reader may come across the repetition of the same story, over and over again. But the importance of the work can never be undervalued in view of the fact that it has preserved numerous traditions of respectable antiquity and versions of texts occurring in the Pāli canon.

*Mahāvastu*  
its character

The *Mahāvastu* has yet another claim to its importance, for in it the reader discovers a storehouse of stories. It is a truth that nearly half of the book is devoted to Jātakas and stories of like nature. Most of the narratives remind us of the stories of Purāṇas and the history of Brahmadatta may be cited as an instance. To conclude, the *Mahāvastu*, though a work of the Hīnayāna school, betrays some affinity to the Mahāyānistic thought. The mention of a number of Buddhas and the conception of Buddha's self-begottenness, are ideas associated with the Mahāyāna school.

Lalitavistara its character

The literature of the Mahāyāna school of Buddhism is extremely rich. Though originally a work of the Sāvāstivādin school attached to the Hīnayāna, the *Lalitavistara* is believed to be one of the most sacred Mahāyāna texts, inasmuch as it is regarded as a Vaipulyasūtra. That the work contains the Mahāyānistic faith may easily be inferred from the very title of the work which means 'the exhaustive narrative of the sport of the Buddha'. A critical study of the work reveals, however, that it is but a redaction of an older Hīnayāna text expanded and embellished in the sense of

the *Mahāvamśa* a biography of the Buddha representing the Sāvastivādin school. It is also a fact that the present *Lalitavistara* is not the work of a single author it is rather 'an anonymous compilation in which both the old and the young fragments have found their places. Such being the case it is hardly proper to regard the work as a good old source for the knowledge of Buddhism. The reader finds in it the gradual development of the Buddha legend in its earliest beginnings. Hence there is hardly any significance in the statement of Professor Vallet Poussin when he says that the *Lalitavistara* represents the popular Buddhism. The book however is of great importance from the standpoint of literary history inasmuch as it has supplied materials for the monumental epic of Aśvaśeṣa entitled the *Buddhacarita*.

To determine the date of composition of the work it would be necessary to bear in mind that the work is a Vaipulyasūtra. In the Vaipulyasūtras we find sections in a redaction of prose followed by one in verse, the latter being in substance, only a repetition of the former. The idiom of prose portions is a kind of Sanskrit while that of

Date of  
Lalitavistara  
Kern's  
view

verses, Gāthās, a veiled Piākrit somewhat clumsily Sanskritized as much as the exigencies of the metric have permitted Professor Kern thinks that the prose passages are undoubtedly translations of a Piākrit text into Sanskrit. The question, therefore, arises why and when has the original idiom been replaced by Sanskrit? It is known that in India it has been the common fate of all Piākrits that they have become obsolete whilst the study and practice of Sanskrit have been kept up all over the country as the common language of science and literature, and also as a bond between Aryans and Dravidians. Now it may be asked, at what time then might Sanskrit have reconquered its ascendancy? Professor Kern suggests that it was in all probability shortly before or after the council in the reign of that great Indo-Scythian King Kaniska.

Nariman's  
view and  
conclusions

Mr G. K. Nariman, in his Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism, says that it is an erroneous conception that the *Lalitavistara* was translated into Chinese in the first Christian era. Moreover, he doubts that the Chinese biography of Buddha, called the Phuyau-king, published in 300 A.D., is the second translation of our present text of the

*Lalitavistara* On the other hand, he says that a precise rendering of the Sanskrit text was completed in Tibetan and it was produced as late as the fifth century A.D. It may however, be noted here that Professor Kern has taken sufficient pains to prove that there is much that is of respectable antiquity in the work. Taking this factor into consideration its date may be assigned some time before the Christian era.

The most outstanding Buddhist writer in Sanskrit is Asvaghosa. Round his date hangs a veil of mystery. Dr. Smith writes in his History of India. In literature the memory of Kaniska is associated with the names of the eminent Buddhist writers Nāgārjuna, Asvaghosa, and Vasumitra. Asvaghosa is described as having been a poet, musician, scholar, religious controversialist and zealous Buddhist monk orthodox in creed and a strict observer of discipline. Judged from all evidences it may be concluded that Kaniska flourished in 78 A.D. Hence Asvaghosa who adorned his court, flourished in the first century of the Christian era.<sup>1</sup>

Asvaghosa  
his date

<sup>1</sup> In the chronological group generally accepted by numismatics the Kaniska group succeeds the Kadphri

Buddha-  
carita

The masterpiece of Aśvaghosa is his *Buddhacarita* the life-history of Buddha. From the account of I-tsing it appears that the *Buddhacarita* with which he was acquainted, consisted of *twenty-eight* cantos. The  
ses group. But even this view has not the unanimous support of scholars. If, as some scholars hold, the group of kings comprising Kaniska, Vāsika, Huvika and Vāsudeva preceded Kadphises I, the coins of the two princes last named should be found together, as they are not, and those of Kadphises II and Kaniska should not be associated, as they are. Chief supporters of the view stated above are Dr Fleet, Frank and Mr Kennedy. Dr Frank lays stress on the fact that Chinese historians as apart from Buddhist authors make no mention of Kaniska. But he himself answers the question when he holds that with the year 125 A.D., the source was dried up from which the chroniclers could draw the information regarding the peoples of Turkestan. Dr Fleet connects Kaniska's accession to the throne with the traditional Vikrama Samvat, beginning with the year 57 B.C. This view has been ably controverted by Dr Thomas and discoveries of Professor Marshall totally belie its truth. Inscriptions, coins and the records of Huen Tsang point out that Kaniska's dominion included Gandhāra. According to Chinese evidence, Kipin or Kāpiśa-Gandhāra was not under the Kusāna kings in the second half of the first century B.C. Professors Marshall, Sten Konow, Smith and other scholars think that Kaniska's rule begins about 125 A.D. The evidence of Sue Vihāi

Tibetan translation, too, contains the same number of cantos. But unluckily the Sanskrit text comprises *seventeen* cantos only, of which, again, the last four are of dubious origin. It is said that one Amrtānanda of

inscriptions proves that Kaniska's empire extended as far as the Lower Indus valley but the Junāgadh inscription of Rudradāman tells us that the dominions of the Emperor included Sindhu and Sauvira. It is known that Rudradāman lived from A.D. 130 to A.D. 150. Under the circumstances it is almost impossible to reconcile the suzerainty of the Kuṣāṇa King with the independence of this powerful satrap (cf. *Śāyama dhigatam mahāksatrapanāma*). From Kaniska's dates 3—23 Vīśiṣka's dates 24—28 Huviṣka's dates 31—60 and Vāsudeva's dates 74—98 it is almost evident that Kaniska was the originator of an era. But according to our evidence no new era was in vogue about the beginning of the second century A.D. Dr. R. C. Mazumdar is of opinion that the era started by Kaniska was the Kalachuri era of 248–49 A.D. But Professor Jouveau Dubreuil contends that it is not likely that Vāsudeva's reign terminated after 100 years from Kaniska's date of accession for Mathurā where Vāsudeva reigned came under the Nīgas about 350 A.D. It may be further mentioned that for the reason stated above we can hardly accept the theory of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar who accepts A.D. 278 as the date of Kaniska's accession. According to Professors Ferguson Oldenberg Thomas R. D. Banerjee Rapson and others Kaniska started the Śaka era commencing from 78 A.D.



the ninth century A D added these four cantos. Even the manuscript discovered by MM Haraprasāda Śāstrin, reaches down to the middle of the fourteenth canto.

Professor Dubieul does not accept the view as well on the following grounds. First, if the view that Kujula-kara-Kadphises and Hermaios reigned about 50 A D and that Kaniska founded the era in 78 A D is accepted, there remain only *twenty-eight* years for the end of the reign of Kadphises I and the entire reign of Kadphises II. But Kadphises II succeeded an octogenarian and it is not impossible that his reign was one of short duration. Professor Marshall says that Professor Dubieul has discovered at Taxila a document which can be placed in 79 A D and the king, it mentions, was certainly not Kaniska. But Professor H. C. Ray Chaudhuri has shown that the title Devaputra was applicable to the Kaniska group and not to the earlier group. The omission of a personal name does not prove that the first Kusāna king was meant. Secondly, Professor Dubieul says that Professor Sten Konow has shown that Tibetan and Chinese documents prove that Kaniska lived in the second century A D. But it is not improbable that this Kaniska is the Kaniska of the Āra inscription of the year 41 which, if referred to the Śaka era, would give a date that would fall in the second century A D. Po-t'iao may be one of the successors of Vāsudeva I. Professors Banerjee and Smith recognize the existence of more than one Vāsudeva. Finally, Professor Konow has shown that inscriptions of the Kaniska era and the Śaka era are not dated in

The *Buddhacarita* is really a work of art. Unlike the *Mahavastu* and the *Lalitavistara*, it shows a systematic treatment of the subject matter. Nowhere will the reader come across a confused or incoherent description. Throughout the work, the poet is very cautious about the use of figures of speech, and this abstinence from the superabundant employment of figures of speech has lent special charm to the merit of the work. Over and above this, the presentment of the miraculous in the Buddha legend has been done with equal moderation. Thus, in short, the work is an artistic creation. An account of the assemblage of fun and young ladies watching from gabled windows of high mansions, the exit of the royal prince from the capital is followed by a vivid life-like description of how he came in contact with the hateful spectacle of senility. The

A critic  
appreci-  
ation

the same manner. The learned scholar shows that the inscriptions of Kaniska are dated in different fashions. In the Kharosthi inscriptions Kaniska follows the method of his Śaka Pallava predecessors. On the other hand in the Brāhmi inscriptions he follows the ancient Indian method. Is it then impossible that he adopted a third method to suit the local conditions in Western India?

ladies, when they came to know that the prince was going out of the city, rushed to the window, careless of girdles falling off from their bodies and the poet speaks of their faces as so many full-blown lotuses with which the palace was decorated. The poet shows high artistic craftsmanship in depicting how the prince overcame the lures of sweet ladies who made an attempt to divert his mind from the desire to bid good-bye to all the joys and comforts of the world and also in the description of the famous scene in which the prince, gazing on the undecked bodies of the ladies, locked in the sweet embrace of sleep, resolved to abandon the palace. No less artistically pathetic is the scene in which the prince takes leave of his charioteer and the conversation between the two is remarkable for the spirit of absolute disinterestedness towards worldly happiness, which is displayed by the prince. The poet is also an adept in the description of battles, and no one will forget the spirited picture of the contest of Buddha against the demon Māra and his monstrous hosts. Evidences are also discernible in the work to show that the poet was familiar with the doctrine of statecraft.

Asvaghosa is the author of another epic, the *Saundarananda*, which has been discovered and edited by MM Haraprasāda Sastrin. This work also turns round the history of Buddha's life, but the central theme is the history of the reciprocal love of Sundarī and Nanda, the half brother of Buddha, who is initiated into the order against his will by the latter.

*Saundara  
nanda*

The third work of the poet is a lyrical poem, the *Gandistotragatha*, reconstructed in the Sanskrit original from the Chinese by A von Stael Holstein.

*Gandisto  
tragatha*

Another work of the poet is the *Sutralanlāra*,<sup>1</sup> which undoubtedly is a later production than the *Buddhacarita*, inasmuch as the former quotes the latter. It is to be regretted that the Sanskrit original is not yet available, what we have is only the Chinese translation of the work. This *Sutralanlāra* is a collection of pious legends after the model of Jatakas and Avadānas. This work however, has furnished us with a clue to the existence of dramatic

*Sutralan  
kāra*

<sup>1</sup> Dr Winternitz is of opinion that this work was written by Kumāralīta a junior contemporary of Asvaghosa. The work bears the title *Kalpanūmaṇḍitīkā* or *kalpanālanakṛitīkā*.

literature even at the time Aśvaghosa. In the piece relating to Māia we have the recapitulation of a drama.

There is a positive evidence to show that Aśvaghosa was a dramatist as well and in this connection reference may be made to the momentous discovery of the concluding portion of a *nine-act* drama entitled the *Śāriputraprakaraṇa* which treats of the conversion of Śāriputra and his friend Maudgalyāyana. Among the valuable manuscript treasures in palm-leaf recovered from Tufan there is a fragmentary manuscript in which Professor Ludevís found this drama which bore the name of Aśvaghosa as its author.

One more work attributed to the poet is the *Mahāyānasraddhotpādasūtra*, a philosophical treatise on the basis of the Mahāyāna doctrine.<sup>1</sup> Herein, as Professor Lévi remarks, the author shows himself as a profound metaphysician, as an intrepid reviver of a doctrine which was intended to regenerate Buddhism. It is believed that the author came of a Brāhmana family and that he was later initiated into the doctrine of Buddhism.

<sup>1</sup> According to Dr. Winternitz this work has been wrongly ascribed to Aśvaghosa.

Śāriputra-  
prakaraṇa

Mahāyāna-  
sraddhot-  
pādasūtra

At first, he joined the Śarvāstivādin school and then prepared for the Mahāyāna. It was at one time believed that Aśvaghoṣa was a pioneer in the field of Mahāyānism but it is better to suppose that he was not the first to write a treatise on that subject, but was a strong exponent of it. For, it is undeniable that the Mahāyāna school developed long before Aśvaghoṣa.

Another work attributed to Aśvaghoṣa, is the *Vajrasūci*. Here the author takes up the Brāhmanic standpoint and disputes the authority of sacred texts and the claims of caste, and advocates the doctrine of equality. In the Chinese *T'ipitaka* Catalogue the work has been ascribed to Dharmakīrti.<sup>1</sup>

*Vajrasūci*

Mātrecetā is the mystical name of a Buddhist Sanskrit poet who according to the Tibetan historian Fa-hien, is none other than Aśvaghoṣa. According to I-tsing Mātrecetā is the author of the *Catussata* *lastotia* and the *Satapancaśatī* *anumastotia*, two poems in four hundred and one hundred and fifty verses respectively. Fragments of the Sanskrit original of the former have been discovered in Central Asia.

*Mātrecetā*  
his works

<sup>1</sup> Vide Bunyiu Nanjo Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist *T'ipitaka* No. 1303

The poems show some artistic excellence. Another work attributed to him is the *Mahānāga-Kanikalekha* <sup>1</sup>

Āryacandra  
Maitreyavyākaraṇa

Āryacandra belonging probably to the same period as that of Mātīcetā, is known as the author of the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* or the *Maitreyasamiti* which is in the form of a dialogue between Gotama Buddha and Śāṃputra. The work, translated into various languages, seems to have been very popular.

Āryasūra  
Jātakamālā

Very well-known is the name of the poet Āryasūra, the author of the popular *Jātakamālā*, written after the model of the *Sūtrālankāra*. Among the frescoes in the caves of Ajantā, there are scenes from the *Jātakamālā* with inscribed strophes from Āryasūra. The inscriptions belong to the sixth century A D, but as another work of the poet was translated into Chinese in 434 A D, he must have lived in the fourth century A D.

Saddharma-  
pundarikā,  
Kāṇḍavyūha,  
Sukhāvatīvyūha  
and  
Aksobhavyūha

The Buddhist Sanskrit literature belonging purely to the Mahāyāna school has preserved a number of books called the Mahāyānasūtras which are mainly devoted to the glorification of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas. The most important of

<sup>1</sup> F W Thomas Mātīcetā and the Mahānāga-Kanikalekha (IA Vol XXXII)

them is the *Saddharmapundarikā* written in the manner of the Purāṇas. The book which is a glorification of Buddha Śakyamuni, contains elements of quite different periods, for it is believed that Sanskrit prose and Gāthas in mixed Sanskrit could not have developed at the same time. The book was translated into Chinese between 225 A.D. and 316 A.D. The original, therefore, must have been composed not later than the second century A.D. Some scholars, however, like to give it an early date. But even Professor Kern has not been able to find out passages which may show any ancient thought. Another work is the *Karanda vyūha* preserved in two versions and betraying a theistic tendency. It contains a glorification of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara. It was translated into Chinese as early as 270 A.D. The *Sukharaṭi vyūha* in which is glorified the Buddha Amitabha, is one more important book in which the reader may find a longing for spiritual liberation. The *Aksobhya vyūha* which was translated into Chinese between 385 A.D. and 433 A.D., contains an account of Buddha Aksobhya.

The philosophical writings of Buddhist



Philosophi-  
cal litera-  
ture

poets constitute no mean contribution to early Sanskrit literature. Among philosophical works belonging to the earliest Mahāyānasūtras mention should be made of the *Prajñāpāramitā*s which occupy a unique place from the point of view of the history of religion. The Chinese translation of a *Prajñāpāramitā* was made as early as 179 A.D. Other philosophical Mahāyānasūtras are the *Buddhāvatamsaka*, the *Gandavyūha*, the *Daśabhūmaka*, the *Ratnakūṭa*, the *Rāstrapāla*, the *Lankāvatāra*, the *Samādhirāja* and the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*.

Nāgārjuna  
his works

The *Mādhyamikakārikā* which is a systematic philosophical work of the class with which we are familiar in the Brāhmanic philosophical literature was written in a metrical form (in four hundred verses) by Nāgārjuna whose name is associated with the Kusāna King Kaniska.<sup>1</sup> Nāgārjuna is also known as the author of the *Akūṭobhaya*, a commentary on his own work, which is preserved in a Tibetan translation. The *Yuktisastikā*, the *Śūnyatāsaptati*, the *Pratītyasamutpādaḥrdaya*, the *Mahāyānavimśaka*, the *Vigrahavyāvartanī*,

<sup>1</sup> Some think that Nāgārjuna lived at the close of the second century A.D.

the *Elaslokastra*, the *Prajñadanda* and a few commentaries are his other works. There is another work the *Dharmasamgraha*, which passes as his composition<sup>1</sup>

In the Chinese translations (101 A.D.) of the biographies of Asvaghosa and Nāgārjuna there occurs the name of one Āryadeva. His *Catuvastaka* is a work on the Mādhyamika system and is a polemic directed against the Brāhmanic ritual. His other works are the *Diadastanilayastra* and the *Cittasuddhipalāna*. Maitreyanātha, the real founder of the Yogācāra school, is the author of the *Abhisamayalanilānīśa*, translated into Chinese probably in the fourth century A.D. Ārya Asanga, the famous student of Maitreyanātha, wrote the *Yogacarabhūmiśāstra* besides a few works all preserved in Chinese translations. Vasubandhu Asanga, a strong adherent of the Sarvāstivādin school, whom Professor Takakusu places between 420 A.D. and 500 A.D. and to whom Professor Wogihara assigns a date between 390 A.D. and 470 A.D., wrote the *Abhidharmakośa* and the *Paramarthasaptati* to combat the Sāṅkhya

Āryadeva  
Maitreya  
nātha  
Ārya  
Asanga  
and  
Vasubandhu  
Asanga  
their works

<sup>1</sup> The *Suhṛllekha* is ascribed to Nāgārjuna. It contains no Mādhyamika doctrine.

philosophy. In his later life, when he is believed to have been converted into Mahāyāna, he wrote the *Tyñaptimātratāsiddhi*.

Dignāga  
his works

Dignāga is the chief of the early philosophers who had made valuable contribution through his masterpieces, the *Pramāna-samuccaya* and the *Nyāyapraveśa*. He lived probably in the fifth century A.D. To the same century probably belonged Sthānmati and Dharmapāla who wrote valuable commentaries on the Mādhyamika system<sup>1</sup>.

Avadāna  
literature

The vast field of Avadāna literature presents a good and sufficient specimen of Sanskrit writing by Buddhist poets. The word *avadāna* signifies a 'great religious or moral achievement as well as the history of a great achievement'. Such a great act may consist in the sacrifice of one's own life, but also may be confined to the founding of an institution for the supply of incense, flowers, gold and jewels to, or the building of, sanctuaries. Avadāna stories are designed to inculcate that dark (ignoble) deeds bear

<sup>1</sup> Later philosophical works, belonging to definitely identified schools of Buddhism, e.g., the works of Yaśomitra, Candrakīrti, Śāntideva, Dharmakīrti, Dharmottara and others, will be treated in detail in a subsequent chapter on Philosophy.

dark (ignoble) fruits while white (noble) acts beget white (noble) fruits Thus they are also tales of *Varman*

The *Avadānaśataka* heads the list of works on Avadāna literature It consists of ten decades each having a theme of its own Another work the *Karmaśataka*, preserved only in the Tibetan translation bears close affinity to the former Yet another collection of stories in Tibetan (translated of course, from original Sanskrit) is known in the world's literature as *Dsānglun*

Avadāna  
ataka and  
Karmasa  
taka

A well known collection of Avadāna literature is the *Dīvyāvadāna* The book belongs broadly to the Hīnayāna school but traces of Mahāyānistic influence may yet be discovered The collection is composed of many materials and no uniformity of language is, therefore possible But the language is lucid, and true poetry is not wanting The book has a great importance from the standpoint of Indian sociology As regards the time of redaction, it may be said that as Asoka's successors down to Puṣyamitra are mentioned and the word *dīnara* is frequently used a date prior to the second century A D, can hardly be assigned to it

Dīvyava  
dana

Mention may be made of the *Aśokava*

## REFERENCES

- Keith, A B : A History of Sanskrit Literature  
 Kern H      Manual of Buddhism  
 Nauman, G K      Literary History of Sanskrit  
                          Buddhism  
 Raychaudhuri, H C      Political History of An-  
                          cient India  
 Smith, V A      Oxford History of India  
 Winternitz, M      A History of Indian Literature,  
                          Vol II

<sup>1</sup> A most extensive work on Avadāna-literature is the *Avadānakalpalatū* of Ksemendia of the eleventh century A D The work has been written in the style of ornate Court-epics

## CHAPTER SIX

### COURT EPICS

#### A

### INTRODUCTION

Authoritative writers on Sanskrit rhetoric have given an exhaustive list of the characteristics of epic poems in Classical Sanskrit. These characteristics may be divided under *two* heads. Of them the essential characteristics, the more important, are based on the conception of the *three* constituents of poetry viz., the plot (*vastu*) the hero (*neti*) and the sentiment (*rasa*)<sup>1</sup>. The plot of an epic must have a historical basis and should not be fictitious. The hero must be an accomplished person of high lineage and should be of the type technically called

Character  
istics es  
sential

<sup>1</sup> Generally the sentiments are *eight* in number viz. *śṛṅgāra* (erotic) *hāsyā* (comic) *karuṇā* (pathetic) *raudra* (furious) *vīra* (heroic) *bhayānaka* (terrible) *bībhatsa* (disgustful) and *adbhuta* (marvellous). It is held by some that the *śānta* (quietistic) was added later on by Abhinavagupta, the erudite commentator on Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*. This was perhaps added for representing the spirit of *mahāprasthāna* in the *Mahābhārata*. It is even argued that Bharata has enumerated the eight sentiments for the drama only and not for the epic.

Dhñodāṭṭa Delineation of various sentiments and emotions is the third characteristic

Character  
istics  
non-essen-  
tial

The non-essential characteristics which are formal and apply only to technique, are many in number. They demand (i) that the epic should begin with a benediction, salutation or statement of facts, (ii) that chapters or sections should bear the appellation *sarga* (iii) that the number of cantos should not exceed *thirty* and should not be less than *eight*, (iv) that the number of verses in each canto should not generally be less than *thirty* and should not exceed *two hundred*, (v) that there should be descriptions of sunrise and sunset pools and gardens, amorous sports and pleasure-trips and the like, (vi) that the development of the plot should be natural and the *five* junctures of the plot (*sandhis*) should be well-arranged, and (vii) that the last two or three stanzas of each canto should be composed in a different metre or metres <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is easy to find that these characteristics are not always present in every epic. The *Haravijaya* in *fifty* cantos, some cantos of the *Naiṣadhiṇyācarita* containing more than *two hundred* verses and the first canto of the *Bhāṭṭikāvya* having only *twenty-seven* verses, are examples to the point

## B

### GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF COURT EPICS

The name of Aśvaśhoṣa has come down to us as one of the earliest known epic poets. An account of his two great epics the *Buddhacarita* and the *Saundarananda* has already been given in a preceding chapter.

A vāṣhoṣa

The next great epic poet is Kālidāsa whose age can hardly be determined with any amount of precision. It is most deplorable that scholars differ widely in their opinions in fixing the age of this prince of Indian poets. The most popular theory of the day states that the poet flourished during the reign of Candragupta II (380 A D — 415 A D), that his powers were at their highest during the reign of Kumāragupta I (415 A D — 455 A D) and that he lived to see the reign of Skandagupta (455 A D — 480 A D).<sup>1</sup>

K l dāsa  
his age

<sup>1</sup>The date of Kālidāsa is one of the most perplexing questions in the history of Sanskrit literature and the opinions of scholars however ingeniously conceived fail to give us definiteness and certainty. It is a fact to be regretted that India has not preserved the history of her greatest poet and dramatist. Tradition has been busy in weaving round the name of Kālidāsa many fictitious stories and it is almost impossible to



The *Kumārasambhava* of Kālidāsa is an epic in *seventeen* cantos of which the first *eight* are belived to be genuine Mallinātha writes his commentary on the first eight

separate at such a distant date the historical fact from its rich colouring of fables The traditional theory makes Kālidāsa a contemporary of the Vikrama Samvat, the initial year of which is 57 B C Among the chief supporters of this theory are the late Sir William Jones, Dr Peterson, Principal S Roy, and Mr I R Bālasubrahmanyam Principal Roy has argued that the Bhītā medallion found near Allahabad by Dr Marshall in 1909-10 A D pictures a scene which looks exactly like the opening scene of the *Śākuntala* The medallion belongs to the Śunga period 185-73 B C Moreover, the diction and style of Kālidāsa definitely establishes him as a predecessor of Aśvaghoṣa who has made use of the description of Aja's entry to the capital found in the *Raghuvamśa*, and has borrowed Kālidāsa's words and style But archæologists are of opinion that the scene found in the Allahabad Bhītā medallion cannot be definitely proved to be identical with the scene in the *Śākuntala* Professor Cowell in his edition of the *Buddhacarita* remarks that it is Kālidāsa who imitates Aśvaghoṣa and not vice versa Mr Bālasubrahmanyam has based his theory on the internal evidences found in Kālidāsa's dramas Thus the epilogue of the *Mālavikāgnimitra* supports that Kālidāsa lived in the reign of Agnimitra, the son of Pusyamitra, of the first century B C The system of law, specially that of inheritance, as found

cantos alone. There is also difference of opinion regarding the propriety of the theme of the later cantos. The theme of the epic is the marriage of Lord Śiva and Umā and the

in the *Śakuntala* points to the fact that the poet must have lived before the beginning of the Christian era. Moreover, there was one Vikramāditya in Ujjayini in the first century B.C. and Kālidāsa's works indirectly allude to him as the poet lived in his court.

Dr Peterson has no particular argument to take his stand upon. He simply writes Kālidāsa stands near the beginning of the Christian era if indeed he does not overtop it. Sir William Jones in his introduction to the *Śakuntala* advances no argument but accepts the B.C. theory.

Another theory places Kālidāsa in the sixth century A.D. The late Mr Haraprasāda Śāstrin, one of the supporters of this theory, has pointed out that the defeat of Hūnas by Raghu in course of his world conquest refers to the conquest of Hūnas by Skandagupta (455 A.D.—480 A.D.). And the terms Digvijaya and Nicula occurring in the *Meghaduta* refer to the great teachers who lived before Kālidāsa. Professor Max Müller, another adherent of this doctrine, has based his theory on the suggestions of Professor Fergusson, who points out that the era of the Mūlāvas was put back to 36 B.C. and Yaśodharma-deva Viśnuvardhana Vikramāditya, who conquered the Hūnas in 344 A.D., commemorated his victory by starting the Mūlāva era. But in doing so he willingly antedated it by 600 years. Fergusson's theory (known as

buth of Kāṭṭikeya who vanquished the demon Tārika. Scholars are of opinion that the work is one of the first compositions of the poet.

Raghu-  
vamsa

The *Raghuvamśa*, which is undoubtedly a production of a mature hand, deals with the life-history of the kings of the Ikṣvāku family in general and of Rāma in particular (the Koru theory), however, has been exploded by Dr. Fleet who pointed out by his researches that there was no Vikramāditya who achieved a victory over the Hūnas in 544 A.D., and furthermore, that there was in existence an era known as the Mālava era long before 544 A.D. Thus the theory of Professor Max Müller is without any historical value. In this connection, mention may be made of his once popular and now discarded 'Renaissance Theory of Classical Sanskrit Literature', which states that there was a revival of the Sanskrit learning and literature in the wake of the Gupta civilization and culture and that Kālidāsa was the best flower of this age.

It is, however, generally believed that Kālidāsa flourished in the reign of Candragupta II of the Imperial Gupta dynasty (380 A.D. — 415 A.D.). But it has been argued that his best works were written during the reign of Kumāragupta I (415 A.D. — 455 A.D.). But some would like to suggest that the poet lived to see the reign of Skandagupta (455 A.D. — 480 A.D.). It should be noted, however, that both Candragupta and Skandagupta held the title of 'Vikramāditya', while Kumāragupta had the title of 'Mahendraditya'.

The epic which is composed in *nineteen* cantos, is the tale of Vālmīki retold with the mastery of a finished poet. It is said that the work fulfils to a considerable extent the conditions of Sanskrit epic poetry.

It is not difficult to surmise the date of Bhāravi as his name is mentioned along with Kalidāsa in the famous Aihole inscription of Pulakesin II, dated 634 A.D. Bhāravi has to his credit only one epic viz., the *Kiratarjuniya* which is based on the *Mahabharata*. The poem describes how Arjuna obtained the Pasupati weapon from Śiva. The work is in *nineteen* cantos and is written in an ornate style, though full of dignity of sense (*arthagaurya*) with occasional jingling of words.

Bhāravi  
Kiratar  
juniya

Nowhere in the literature of the world can be found a single instance where poetry has been written with the sole object of illustrating the rules and principles of grammar. The *Bhāṭṭikavya* or *Rāvanavādha* which is written in *twenty two* cantos, is divided into *four* sections, viz., *Pralīnakanda*, *Prasannakanda*, *Alanlāṭalanda* and *Tīnantalanda*. The poem is an epic depicting the life history of Rāma from his birth up to the time of Ravana's death. The author of this

Bhāṭṭi  
Rāvana  
vādha

epic, Bhaṭṭi, must be distinguished from the great grammarian-philosopher Bhaṭṭarhari, popularly known as Hari. The author writes in his own work that he lived in Valabhi under one Śīdharasena. History gives us four Dharasenas, the last of whom died in 651 A.D. It is, therefore, probable that Bhaṭṭi flourished in the latter half of the sixth and the first quarter of the seventh century A.D. It may be mentioned in this connection that Bhaṭṭi lived before Bhāmaha, the great rhetorician who decies the poetic excellence of the *Rāvanavadha*<sup>1</sup>. Though the work is a grammatical poem, still in more places than one the poet has given ample proof of his artistic talents. The second, tenth and twelfth cantos of the poem may be cited as instances.

Kumāradāsa, said to be the King of Ceylon from 517 A.D. to 526 A.D., is mentioned as a poet of remarkable talent by Rājasekhara. It is maintained by Dr. Keith that the poet knew the *Kāśikāṭṭi* (650 A.D.), and was known to Vāmana (800 A.D.). The theme of his poem, the *Jānakīharana*, in *twenty-five* cantos, is taken from the *Rāmāyana*, as the

Kumāra  
dāsa  
Jānakī  
harana

title indicates. The poet follows in the foot steps of Kālidāsa. Though he does not display imagination of a high order, he may still be called a vigorous descriptive poet. He is fond of alliteration, but he is careful enough not to carry it to the point of affectation.

Ānandavardhana the great rhetorician of the ninth century A.D. mentions Māgha who must have flourished in the eighth century A.D. He was the son of Dattatrayaśrīya and mentions Jinendrabuddhi, the author of the famous grammatical work, the *Nyasa* whose date is believed to be 700 A.D.<sup>1</sup> Māgha's *Śrīsupālavadhā* is a work in twenty cantos based on a legend of the *Mahabharata*. His style is extremely ornate and he often sacrifices sense for jugglery in words. He imitates Bhāravi but his style is without the dignity of the latter. But it must be admitted on all hands that he commands much luxuriance of expression and thought.

The fascinating story of Nala and Damayanti in the *Mahabharata* forms the central theme of Srīharṣa's masterpiece the *Naiṣadhacarita* or *Naiṣadhyacarita* which was written in the latter half of the twelfth

Māgha  
Śrīsupāla  
vadhā

Srīharṣa  
Naiṣadha  
carita

century A D The work is written in *twenty-two* cantos The poet is a scholar of repute in the different systems of Indian philosophy and has a thorough command over grammar and lexicon Though he does not show that power of poetical suggestion which distinguishes the writings of great Indian poets like Kālidāsa, his power of expression is singularly captivating What strikes us as his defect is that he has a special liking for exaggerated statements in the form of poetic conceit.

## C

## LESSER EPIC POEMS

<i>Jāmbavatī-vijaya</i> and <i>Pātūla-vijaya</i>	}	ascribed to Pāṇini—according to some, the two are the names of the one and the same book—not free from grammatical errors—the authorship is much disputed
<i>Vānarūpa-kāvya</i>		lost to us
<i>Padyacūdāmanī</i>		ascribed to Buddhaghosa (not later than the fifth century A D)
<i>Kunteśvaradantya</i>		ascribed to Kālidāsa by Ksemendra
<i>Hayagrīvavadha</i>		a lost work by Bhātīmentha who flourished under Mātīgupta of the sixth century A D praised by Rājasekhara

*Padmapurāna* by Ravisena of the seventh century  
A D—containing a glorification of Ṛṣabha the  
first Tīrthakara

<i>Rājanārjunīya</i>	}	by Bhaumaka—written in <i>twenty seven</i> cantos in the fashion of Bhaṭṭi—based on the strife between Kṛtavīrya and Rāvana
or <i>Ārjunarājanīya</i>		

*Harī aṃśapurāna* by Jinasena of the eighth century  
A D—in *sixty six* cantos—describing the  
story of the *Mahābhārata* in a Jīnistic setting

*Kapphaṇḍibhyudaya* by Śivasvāmin a Kāśhmīrian  
Buddhist during the reign of Avantivarman of  
the ninth century A D—written in *twenty*  
cantos—based on a tale in the *Avadūnasataka*

*Haravijaya* by Ratnākara a Kāśhmīrian of the  
ninth century A D—based on the slaying of  
the demon Andhaka by Śiva—written in *fifty*  
cantos—influenced by Bīna and Mīgha

*Rūgharapūṇḍarīya* by Kavirāja—mentioned by Rāja -  
śekhara—probably of the ninth century A D  
—giving us the two stories of the *Rāmāyana*  
and the *Mahābhārata* simultaneously through  
*double entendre*

*Mahāpurāna* by Jinasena and Gunabhadra of the  
ninth century A D—containing *two* parts the  
*Ādipurāna* and the *Uttarapūrāna*

*Parvatibhyudaya* by Jinasena of the ninth century  
A D who has incorporated the entire *Megha*  
*dūta* while relating the story of Pārśvanātha

*Kūdambarikathāsāra* by Abhinanda son of the logi-  
cian Jayantabhatta of the tenth century A D



*Yaśodharacarita* by Vāḍhājña of the first quarter of the tenth century A D —written in *four* cantos

*Kaṛṇahasya* by Halāyudha of the tenth century A D —containing an eulogy of King Kīrti III —written after the style of Bhaṭṭi

*Rāmacarita* by Abhinanda, son of Śatānanda of unknown date

*Rāmāyaṇamañjarī* } by Kṣemendīa of the eleventh  
and *Bhāratamañjarī* } century A D

*Yaśodharacarita* by Māṃkyasūri of the eleventh century A D

*Harivilāsa* by Lohmbarāja of the eleventh century A D

*Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* by Maṇḍikha—a Kāśhmīrian and a pupil of Ruyyaka of the twelfth century A D written in *twenty-five* cantos—based on the tale of the destruction of the demon Tṛpura by Śiva

*Śatruñḡayamāhātmya* by Dhaneśvara of the twelfth century A D written in *fourteen* cantos—containing a glorification of the sacred mountain Śatruñḡaya

*Triṣaṣṭiśalākṣpuruṣacarita* by Hemacandīa of 1088-1172 A D—a highly important work, its seventh book being called the *Jaina-Rāmāyaṇa*, the tenth entitled the *Māhāvīracarita*, containing the life-story of Mahāvīra, and its appendix-section, the *Parīśiṣṭaparvan*, being a mine of fairy tales and stories

*Dharmaśarmābhyaudaya* by Haricandīa of unknown date—written in *twenty-one* cantos

*Neminirūṇa* by Viṅbhata of the twelfth century  
A D—in fifteen cantos—dealing with Neminī  
tha's life

*Balabhārata* by Amaracandra of the thirteenth  
century A D

*Pañḍavacaritra* and } by Dvaprabhasūri of the  
*Mṛgavācaritra* } thirteenth century A D

*Pārsianāthacarita* by Bhṭadevasūri of the thir  
teenth century A D

*Harimaṇa* by Sakalakīrti and his pupil Jinādīpa  
of the fifteenth century A D

*Rasikāñjana* by Rīmācandra of the sixteenth  
century A D—describing the two sentiments  
of love and asceticism through *double entendre*

*Pāñḍavapurāṇa* by Subhacandra of the sixteenth  
century A D—also called the *Jaina Mahā  
bhārata*

*Rūghavanavādhiya* by Haradattasūri of unknown  
date

*Rāghavapāñḍavayyādhaya* by Cidambara of un  
known date

## REFERENCES

- Keith A B A History of Sanskrit Literature  
Macdonell A A A History of Sanskrit Litera  
ture  
Winternitz M A History of Indian Literature  
Vol II

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### DRAMA

#### A

### ORIGIN OF SANSKRIT DRAMA

The origin of Sanskrit drama is a most interesting study in the history of Sanskrit literature and divergent views are found amongst scholars which can hardly be reconciled. It is an undeniable fact that Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* is the earliest known book on Sanskrit dramaturgy. The third century A.D. is the generally accepted date of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, and some scholars hold that the book is a compilation on the basis of an original work of the Sūtra-type. According to a legend found in this book, Brahmā created drama by taking passages for recitation from the *Rgveda*, songs from the *Sāmaveda*, gestures from the *Yajurveda* and emotions from the *Atharvaveda*. Thus a drama is known as the fifth Veda. From Śiva and Pārvatī, Tāṇḍava and Lāsya dances were obtained and Viṣṇu gave the Rīti. The same book also informs us that the dramas were enacted during the Indrādhvaja festival where the sons and disciples of the sage Bharata together with Gandharvas and Apsaras took

Orthodox  
view

part in the play. The first two plays enacted were the *Amitamanthana* and the *Tripuradaha* both written by Brahma himself.

There was a time when the theory of the Greek origin of Indian drama found its adherents amongst scholars<sup>1</sup>. The chief exponent was Professor Windisch (1882) who found many striking similarities between Greek and Sanskrit plays and based his theory on the ground that Indians were in touch with Greeks for a considerable period after the invasion of Alexander and that none of the extant Sanskrit plays belongs to a pre-Christian date. Thus to him the very classification into acts, the prologues and the epilogues, the way in which the actors make their entrance and exit, the term *yajñaniṣa*, the theme and its manipulation, the variety of stage directions, the typical characters like the *Vidūṣaka*, *Pratinayaka* etc.,—all smell of Greek origin. This theory was further corroborated by the discovery in the Sitabenga cave of the Greek theatre in its Indian imitation.<sup>2</sup> But this theory has

Theory of  
Greek  
Origin

<sup>1</sup> The suggestion came from Professor Weber but Professor Pischel vehemently repudiated it.

On the antiquities of Ramgarh Hill District of Sargujā—IA Vol II

been rejected as the points of contrast are far too many. The absence of the *three unities* of *Time, Space and Action* in a Sanskrit drama brings it nearer to an Elizabethan drama than to a Greek drama where the three unities are essential. The difference in time between two acts in a Sanskrit drama may be several years (e.g., the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti where twelve years intervene between the incidents of the first two acts). Moreover, it is only in a particular act of a Sanskrit drama that the actions which happen in a single place are usually represented. Thus while the sixth act of the *Śākuntala* represents the scene at King Duśyanta's palace, the seventh act shows the scene at sage Māṇca's hermitage on the top of the Himālayas and the first part of it represents the king's aerial journey. As for the term *yavanikā*, most scholars think that it is of later introduction and it refers to Persian tapestries and not to anything Greek.

On the other hand, there are some scholars who want to determine the origin of Sanskrit dramas in the same manner in which Western scholars seek to explain the origin of European plays. So it has been argued that as the first Sanskrit play is stated

to have been produced at the Indrāditya festival (which has a parallel in the May pole dance in Europe), the origin of Sanskrit dramas is to be connected with the festivities of the spring after the passing away of the winter. But this theory is rejected as MM Haraprasada Sāstrin has pointed out that the aforesaid Indrāditya festival comes off at the end of the rains.

Professor Ridgeway has connected the origin of Indian drama with the worshipping of dead ancestors. But the theory is inapplicable to the case of Indian Aryans whose ritual of the disposing of the dead has the minimum ostentation.

Ridgeway's theory

The Kṛṣṇa worship is thought by some scholars to be the origin of Sanskrit plays. Thus the role which the Sauraseni Prākṛit plays in a Sanskrit drama is easily explained. But this theory involves anachronism as it remains to be proved that Kṛṣṇa dramas are the earliest Sanskrit dramas.<sup>1</sup>

Kṛṣṇa cult origin

Professor Pischel has set forth the theory that Sanskrit drama in its origin was a puppet play. The stage māṅgi in a Sans

Pischel's theory

<sup>1</sup> It may be proved in the same way that the theories of the Viṣṇu cult, Śiva cult or Rāma cult origin of Indian drama cannot be accepted.

kṛt drama is called Sūtradhāra (the holder of the string) and his assistant Sthāpaka is to enter immediately after the stage-manager and is expected to place in proper position, the plot, the hero or the germ of the play. The puppets also are frequently mentioned in Sanskrit literature, they could be made to dance or move about and they could even be made to talk. Such a talking puppet, impersonating Sītā, is found in one of Rājaśekhara's plays. The episode of the Shadow-Sītā in Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacarita* is reminiscent of the old shadow-play in ancient India.<sup>1</sup> But this theory cannot furnish sufficient explanation of Sanskrit drama in all its bearings, such as, the mixture of prose and verse in a Sanskrit play, as also the varieties of languages and the like.<sup>1</sup>

Origin to  
be traced to  
the Vedic  
period

Another theory on this subject states that the origin of Sanskrit drama should be sought in the Samvāda-hymns of the *Rgveda*. These ballad hymns which are nearly twenty in number, are marked by a dramatic spirit.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Professor Hillebrandt has argued that Professor Pischel's theory cannot be accepted as the puppet-play assumes the pre-existence of the drama.

<sup>2</sup> *RV* I 165 170 and 179, III 33, IV 18, VII 33, VIII 100, X 11, 28, 51—53, 86, 95 and 108, etc.

There are no specific ritualistic applications accompanying these *Samvāda* hymns and they seem to have been recited between the intervals of long sacrificial sessions (*pāriplava*) for the satisfaction of the patrons of sacrifices. But whether the hymns were treated as ballads (as Professors Pischel and Geldner thought), or as regular ritualistic dramas with actual stage directions and action including singing and dancing (as held by Professor von Schroeder), or, finally as narrative stories with an admixture of prose to connect the poems into one whole, with a preponderance of dialogue (as maintained by Professor Oldenberg)—is still keenly disputed amongst scholars<sup>1</sup>

Conclu  
sion

It has been universally found that the growth of drama is intimately connected with royal patronage. And India is no exception. Bearing in our mind the existence of the ritualistic drama which marks the early beginnings of Indian plays we can boldly assert that Sanskrit drama is a product of the Indian mind which viewed life in all its various aspects and passed through many stages of development, being

<sup>1</sup> Professor Hertel has found a full drama in the *Suparnādhyaṃya*



influenced by Jainism and Buddhism in its allegorical sphere or by any other foreign factor and yet maintaining its own peculiarity. No one theory, therefore, can adequately explain all its features and as such one should refrain from making a choice of any one of them.

---

### B

## CHARACTERISTICS OF SANSKRIT DRAMA

Predomi-  
nance of  
sentiment

According to Indian thinkers the best of poets is a dramatist. Sanskrit drama evolved in all its aspects in a particularly Indian atmosphere. Sanskrit dramatists with their inherent aesthetic sense gave more importance to the portrayal of the sentiment than to the character or the plot. Sanskrit dramas were, therefore, highly idealistic and romantic in their character. Though the best of Sanskrit dramas glow with occasional touches of realism, still the fact cannot be denied that the poetic value has never been sacrificed for direct delineation of action or character. Nevertheless we cannot say that

Sanskrit dramatists were totally indifferent to the action of a drama, and it has been said clearly that a drama must have five critical junctures of plot (*sandhi*) viz *mulha* (opening or *protasis*), *pratimula* (progression or *epitasis*) *gaibha* (development or *catastasis*), *umar a* (pause or *peripeteia*) and *nirahana* (conclusion or *catastrophe*) It has been the usual convention with Sanskrit poets that they select the Erotic the Heroic or the Quietistic as the principal sentiment in a *Nāṭaka* (the type of major dramas) which is assisted by every other sentiment according to propriety It needs to be added here that in the opinion of some thinkers the aforesaid convention should not command any respect and any one of the nine sentiments may be the predominant sentiment in a *Nāṭaka*

A charge is often levelled by critics that Sanskrit drama is marred by an absence of tragedy, but it may be answered by saying that what is known as *Vipralambha sangara* (love in separation) more than compensates for the comparatively rare 'Pathetic' which is the prominent sentiment in only one class of minor dramas But it is a fact that Sanskrit dramas have never a tragic crisis

Absence of  
tragedy

tirophe, and the reason is to be found in the conception that it mairs the sentiment. Hence the representation of death, murder, war, revolution and anything indecorous which is a hiatus in aesthetic pleasure, has been prohibited on the stage.

### Hero

As the main interest in Sanskrit drama lies in the creation of the sentiment, it is convenient for a dramatist to take a plot with a popular theme. The hero of the drama must be an accomplished person of high lineage and should belong to the Dhi-rodātta type. He must be a hero either of the earth or of heaven, and sometimes even we find in Sanskrit drama gods side by side with mortal men, and thus is given ample scope to the dramatist's imagination to create the appropriate romantic atmosphere.

### Morality and drama

Like every other branch of Indian literature, Sanskrit drama has also a religious basis and nothing violating the moral and religious code has been represented in Sanskrit drama.

# C

## CLASSIFICATION OF SANSKRIT DRAMAS

It must be said at the outset that the Sanskrit synonym for drama is Rūpaka and not Nāṭya, the latter being a variety of the former which has a more comprehensive import. Authors on Sanskrit dramaturgy have classified Sanskrit dramas into two types (1) the major (Rūpaka) and (2) the minor (Uparūpaka). The varieties of each type differ according to different authorities. The following is the list given by Viśvanātha in his *Sahityadarpaṇa* of the varieties of the two types of Sanskrit dramas.

Rūpaka &  
Uparūpaka

1. The major type (i) Nāṭika (e.g. *Abhijñānaśālikā* of Kālidāsa) (ii) Prākāśa (e.g. *Malatīmadhava* of Bhāṇubhūti) (iii) Bhāṇa (e.g. *Harpuṇācarita* of Vatsarāja) (iv) Vyayoga (e.g. *Madhyama vyayoga* of Bhaṣa) (v) Samvāhaka (e.g. *Samudrāmāthana* of Vatsarāja) (vi) Dīpa (e.g. *Tripurādhara* of Vatsarāja) (vii) Ihamrga (e.g. *Ratnānukarṇa* of Vatsarāja) (viii) Anka or Utsrstikāṅka (e.g. *Saṁsthāyayati*) (ix) Vithi (e.g. *Malavikā*) and (x) Prāśasta (e.g. *Mattavilāsa* of Mahendrapāṇini).

2 The minor type (i) *Nāṭikā* (e g, *Ratnāvalī* of Śiṃ-Hansa) (ii) *Trotaka* (e g, *Vikramorvaśī* of Kālidāsa) (iii) *Gosthī* (e g, *Ravvatamadanīhā*) (iv) *Sattaka* (e g, *Karpūramañjarī* of Rājasekhara) (v) *Nāṭyārāsaka* (e g, *Vilāsavatī*) (vi) *Prasthāna* (e g, *Śingūratilaka*) (vii) *Ullāpva* (e g, *Deṇṭmahādeva*) (viii) *Kāvya* (e g, *Yādarodaya*) (ix) *Pienkhana* (e g, *Vāluadha*) (x) *Rāsaka* (e g, *Menahāhita*) (xi) *Samlāpaka* (e g, *Māyāhāpāhika*) (xii) *Śīgadhita* (e g, *Kīṇḍānasātala*) (xiii) *Śīlpaka* (e g, *Kānakāvatīmādhaṇa*) (xiv) *Vilāsikā* (no work mentioned in *SD*) (xv) *Dumallikā* (e g, *Bindumatī*) (xvi) *Prakāśanikā* (no work mentioned in *SD*) (xvii) *Hallīśa* (e g, *Kelmaravataka*) and (xviii) *Bhānikā* (e g, *Kāmadattā*)<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The works, against which authors are mentioned, have now been published and are all available. The other works are only mentioned by the author of the *Sāhityadarpana* and are not actually known to exist at present.

## D

### GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF SANSKRIT DRAMA

Introduc  
tion

The Indian drama can be traced to the fifth or the fourth century B C. Panini refers to dramatic aphorisms<sup>1</sup> and the *Arthaśastra* of Kautilya, which is a book of the fourth century B C, contains reference to the term *Auslara*, which may have an allusion to the twin sons of Rama or to the proverbially bad character of actors. The *Mahabhasya*, beside its reference to the dramas, *Āmsaradha* and *Balibandha*, speaks of the punting of actors and of the three kinds of artists. In the *Ramayana* we find the mention of Nataka and the *Mahabharata* refers to a wooden feminine figure<sup>2</sup>. In the *Harṇamśa*, however we find unmistakable reference to a full fledged drama acted by Kṛṣṇa's descendants. But Dr Keith looks upon all these evidences as mere references to pantomimes and not to pure dramas. He, however, admits that the dramas of Aśvaghosa and Bhasa, the first extant dramas

<sup>1</sup> Ast IV iii 110

<sup>2</sup> Mbh III xxx 23



reflected in the number of his plays and the variety of their themes. The style of Bhasa is simple, at the same time forceful and conforms to what is known as the Vaidarbha style. The initial characteristic of the dramas of Bhāsa is action which has never been sacrificed for poetry and poetic charm. In fact the plays of Bhasa are really of dramatic value and qualities of a very high order. On the other hand there are scholars who hold that the dramas in their present forms are not the composition of one and the same poet but they are the composite product of the plagiarism of many scribes. Some scholars have gone so far even as to surmise the existence of a genuine Bhāsa of whose works the extant plays are mere abridgement by the traditional players of Southern India (especially Kerala).

Apprecia-  
tion

The *thirteen* plays of Bhasa may be arranged under *three* heads according to the sources from which the plots have been taken — (a) plots taken from the *Ramayana*, (b) plots taken from the *Mahabharata*, the *Harivamśa* and the *Puranas*, and (c) plots taken probably from the *Brhatkatha* of Gunadhya and other popular sources.

Classifica-  
tion of  
Bhāsa's  
dramas



The *Pratimā* (Nāṭaka) which is the most popular of the *Rāmāyana*-plays, is written in seven acts. The story starts from the death of King Daśaratha and ends with Rāma's return to Ayodhyā from Lankā. The second play, based on the *Rāmāyana*, is the *Abhiseka* (Nāṭaka) in six acts. The subject-matter is the coronation of Rāma.

The *Madhyama-vyāyoga* deserves mention first amongst the *Mahābhārata*-plays. This drama (Vyāyoga) in one act amply testifies to the skill of the dramatist in depicting characters. The play is based on the tale of Hidimbā's love for Bhīma. The *Dūta-ghatōtkaca* is also a drama (Vyāyoga) in one act which describes Ghatōtkaca appearing before the Kauravas immediately after the death of Abhimanyu, with the news that Arjuna is preparing for their punishment. The *Kaṇnabhāra* (Vyāyoga) also contains one act, the story being how the armours and earrings of Karna are stolen by India. The story of *Ūrubbhanga* (probably of the Anka type) in one act depicts the fight between Bhīma and Duryodhana ending in the breaking of the latter's thigh. The *Dūtavākya* is also a drama (Vyāyoga) in one act where Kṛṣṇa appears as an

ambassador to bring about reconciliation between the contending parties, the Kauravas and the Pandavas, and is ill treated by Duryodhana who tries to entrap him without success. The *Pañcavatra* is a play (Sama vakāra) in *three* acts. There the story is how Drona undertakes a sacrifice for Duryodhana and seeks as fee the grant of half the kingdom to the Pandavas and Duryodhana promises on the condition that the Pandavas who were living *incognito*, should be found out within five nights. The *Balacarita* is a drama (Nāṭaka) in *five* acts depicting the various incidents in the early life of Kṛṣṇa up to the death of Kamsa. Its plot seems to be derived from the *Hariṃśa* and the Purāṇas describing Kṛṣṇa's life.

Indian critics claim *Śvapnavasavadatta* to be the best of Bhasa's dramas where the poet has displayed his skill of characterization and the fine manipulation of the plot which has made the drama interesting up to the last. The play (Nāṭaka) contains *six* acts. The theme of the play is the marriage between Vatsaraja Udayana and Padmavati, the sister of King Darśaka, which was effected by Yaugandharayana, Udayana's minister, to serve a political

Bṛhatkatha  
plays

purpose To gain the end in view, Yaugandharāyana spread the rumour that Vāsavadattā the former queen of Udayana, had been burnt in a conflagration, but he actually kept her as a deposit to Padmāvatī The *Pratiṣṭhāyauṅgandharāyana* (Nāṭaka) in four acts is the prelude to *Svapnavāsavadatta* which depicts Yaugandharāyana coming to Ujjayinī and causing Vāsavadattā to escape with Udayana who was taken captive by Pradyota Mahāsena while the former was out a-hunting The *Cāṇudatta* is an incomplete drama (Prakarana) in four acts on which Śūdraka seems to have based his *Mrcchakatika* The theme is the love-story of Brāhmaṇa Cāṇudatta and courtesan Vasantasenā The material for this drama was taken from popular stories The *Avimāṇaka* is a play (Nāṭaka) in six acts, having for its theme the union of Princess Kuṅṅgī with Prince Viṣṇusena *alias* Avimāṇaka The plots of all the four dramas are said to have been taken from the *Brhatkathā* and they can be traced to the *Kathāsaritsāgara*

The date and authorship of the *Mrcchakatika* (Prakarana) in ten acts is still a disputed point in the history of Sanskrit

literature<sup>1</sup> According to some scholars, the drama was written by the poet Dandin who quotes a verse of the *Micchakātika* in his *Kāvya-darsa*<sup>2</sup> But the recent discovery of the dramas of Bhīṣa shows that the verse is found in the *Carudatta* and the *Balacārita* also, and it is highly probable that the drama was written just after the *Carudatta* nearly about the first century A.D. It is a point to be noted that though Kālidāsa mentions Bhīṣa, Saumilī and Kāvīputrī he does not say a word about Sūdrakā In the prologue of the *Micchakātika* the royal author has been described as master of various Sāstras He performed a horse sacrifice and in the one hundred and tenth year of his life entered into fire having made over the kingdom to his son From this it is evident that either this portion of the text is an interpolation or that the real author was some one else The name

<sup>1</sup> Vāmana is the earliest known writer to quote from the drama of Sūdrakā

<sup>2</sup> Professor Pischel first ascribes this play to Bhīṣa and next to Dandin According to the orthodox tradition Dandin is the author of three works the other two being the *Kāvya-darsa* and the *Dasa-kumāracarita*

of King Śūdraka is found in the *Rājataran-  
ginī*, the *Kāthāsaritsāgara* and the *Skanda-  
purāṇa*. In some of the manuscripts, Śūdraka  
has been described as a minister of Śālivā-  
hana who subsequently became the ruler of  
Pratisthāna. According to Professor  
Konow, Śūdraka is to be identified with the  
Ābhīra prince, Śivadatta. According to Dr  
Fleet, Śūdraka's son Īśvarasena defeated the  
Andhras and established the Udi era of  
248-49 A.D. The play is a Prakāśana in ten  
acts having the love-story of Cārudatta and  
Vasantasenā for its theme. It is a social  
drama with magnificent touches of realism.  
The characterization is of a high standard.  
The drama is highly suggestive on account  
of its simple and dignified style.

Kālidāsa is acclaimed to be the best of  
Indian dramatists, whom Goethe has  
praised in the most fascinating terms.  
Superb characterization, study of human  
nature and wonderful mastery over the  
Sanskrit language have placed him in the  
forefront of Indian dramatists. Kālidāsa  
is not verbose like later Sanskrit dramatists,  
economy being the most remarkable feature  
of his technique. Though Kālidāsa is pre-  
eminently a poet of love, he can rise occa-

sionally to a tragic elevation. Every character of Kalidāsa's dramas has a core of personality which is sharply individualized. Though it is said that the dramas of Kalidasa lack action to some extent, yet they have a moral purity and a peculiar charm unsurpassed by any other Indian dramatist.

The *Malavikāgnimitra* (Nāṭak) undoubtedly an earlier writing of the dramatist is written in five acts. It describes the love story of Mālavikā and Agnimitra, King of Vidisa and founder of the Sunga dynasty. This drama, unlike the two others, is characterized by quick action. The jester is a veritable rogue and is far more intelligent than the jester in the *Sakuntala*. The female characters and the dancing masters are all productions of really great merit.

Malavikāgnimitra

The second drama, the *Vikramorvasiya*, shows remarkable development over the former in the manipulation of the plot, characterization and language, and there are scholars who think that it is the last of the three dramatic compositions of the poet. The materials for this drama preserved in two recensions, northern and southern, have been taken from a Samvāda hymn of the *Rigveda*. This drama (Tṛṭīyā) which is

Vikramorvasiya

written in *five* acts, has for its theme the union of the earthly king Purūṇavas and the celestial nymph Urvaśī. The fourth act of this drama which is a soliloquy of the love-stricken and frenzied Purūṇavas, is a novel conception of the dramatist.

The *Abhijñānaśakuntalā* or *Śākuntalā* is the production of Kālidāsa's mature hand, which has gained world-wide recognition and the play has been translated into many European languages. The drama (Nāṭaka) which is in *seven* acts, describes the union of Dusyanta and Śākuntalā. The plot of this drama has been taken from the *Mahābhārata*, but the dramatist has introduced many noble innovations. The story is also to be found in the *Padmapurāṇa* and the Pāli Jātaka collections. There are *four* different recensions of this drama, viz., Bengal, North-western, Kāshmirian and South Indian. According to Professor Pischel, the Bengal recension fully represents the original.

Three dramas are ascribed to Haisa, King of Kānyakubja, who reigned from 606 A D to 647 A D<sup>1</sup>. He was the reputed patron of

<sup>1</sup> It is believed by some scholars that the author

Bīṇabhaṭṭa who has glorified him in his *Harṣacarita*. Harṣa's style is not strictly classical but his arrangement of plot is fairly satisfactory.

The *Ratnāvalī* is a drama (Nāṭikā) in four acts which deals with the story of the union of King Udayana and Ratnāvalī daughter of the king of Ceylon.

Ratnāvalī

The *Priyadarśinī* is also a drama (Nāṭikā) in four acts having for its theme the union of Udayana and Priyadarśinī daughter of King Dṛdhavarman. In both these dramas we have not only a similarity of subject matter and form but also a reminiscence of Kālidāsa's *Mālavīgnimitra*.

Priyadarśinī

The *Nāgānanda* is a drama (Nāṭikā) in five acts which describes the self-sacrifice of Jmūtavijaya, Prince of Vidyadharas.

Nāgānanda

Mahendavikrama flourished in the first quarter of the seventh century A.D. His *Mattavilāsa* is a farce (Prahasana) which describes the moral degenerations of the dramatist's contemporary society.

Mahendra  
vikrama  
Mattavilāsa

Bhāṇabhūti is the next great name

of these plays was Bīṇa and not Harṣa. Thus Professor Weber attributes *Ratnāvalī* to Bīṇabhaṭṭa while Professors Konow, Winternitz, Levi and others accept Harṣa's authorship.



after Kālidāsa who is mentioned by Kalhana in his *Rājataranginī* as a poet in the court of Yaśovarman, King of Kānyakubja whose probable date is 736 A D Vākpati also refers to Bhavabhūti in his *Gaudaraha*. As is evident from the prologue of the *Mālatīmādhava*, Bhavabhūti could not enjoy any popularity in his life-time. Nevertheless, Bhavabhūti displays a masterly skill in characterization, and his language is forceful. Though he is pre-eminentlly a poet of the Pathetic sentiment, he has excelled his great predecessor in the delineation of the Heroic and the Wonderful. Bhavabhūti is a follower of the Gauda style, while Kālidāsa is an advocate of the Vaidarbha. Bhavabhūti amplifies his theme, while Kālidāsa suggests it.

Three dramas are ascribed to Bhavabhūti of which the *Mahāvīracarita* is the earliest. The drama (Nāṭaka) is written in *seven* acts, depicting the heroic achievements of Rāma's early life. The plot is based on the *Rāmāyana*, but the dramatist has introduced several significant innovations.

The *Mālatīmādhava* is a Prakāśana in *ten* acts which deals with the love-story of Mālatī and Mādhava. According to some scholars, it is the latest of all his dramas.

The *Uttararamacarita* is regarded as the best product of Bhavabhūti's virile pen where the dramatist has shown his wonderful skill in delineating genuine pathos and describing the sublime and awful aspects of nature. The plot of this drama (Nāṭaka) which is written in seven acts, covers the later life of Rāma, beginning from the banishment of Sītā and ending in their happy re union.

*Uttararā  
macarita*

The date of Viśaḥadattī may be placed somewhere about 860 A.D. as the lunar eclipse mentioned in his drama *Mudrarāśa* refers to the phenomenon of that date. The drama (Nāṭaka) is written in seven acts. The theme is a political intrigue between Rājśiśa the minister of the Nandas and Candiva the great politician, who succeeded in overthrowing the Nandas and winning Rājśiśa to the side of Candragupta. The style of Viśaḥadattī marks a distinct falling off from the lucid diction of Kālidāsa and the grandeur of Bhavabhūti. In fact, the style of *Viśaḥadattī* is highly artificial.

*Viśākha  
datta  
Mudrā  
rākṣaṇa*

Vīmanā and Ānandavardhana quote from the work of Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa who probably flourished in the eighth century A.D. His only drama (Nāṭaka) *Venīśamhara*,

*Bhaṭṭanā  
rāyaṇa  
Venīśa  
māhātā*

written in *six* acts, is based on the story of the *Mahābhārata*. Bhīma kills Duṣśāsana and ties the braid of Draupadī with his blood. Ultimately he succeeds in killing Duryodhana also. Bhattanāyana is undoubtedly a remarkable craftsman among later Sanskrit dramatists, he is particularly adept in describing the Heroic sentiment. The first three acts of the *Veṇṣaṃhāra* are full of action, and the predominant emotion is enthusiasm (*utsāha*). The poet has also very successfully illustrated the manifold technicalities of Sanskrit dramaturgy in his drama.

No other later dramatist was able to dramatize successfully the Rāma-episode, after Bhavabhūti had written his masterpieces. Muṇāi who is not an exception to this rule, wrote his *Anaṅgha āghava* sometime about the beginning of the ninth century A.D. The drama (Nāṭaka) is written in *seven* acts, and the style is clear.

Rājaśekhara was the reputed teacher of King Mahendrapāla of Kanauj (893-907 A.D.). Among his many works, Rājaśekhara has written *four* dramas. The *Bāla āmāyana* is a drama (Nāṭaka) in *ten* acts, dealing with the life-history of Rama. The *Bālabhārata* is an incomplete drama (Nāṭaka) of which *two*

acts only available The *Karpuramañjarī*, a play (Sattakā) in four acts is written in Prākṛit The *Viddhaśalabhāṅgilā* is also a drama (Natikā) in four acts Rājasekhara's style is highly artificial, but the dramatist himself claims to be a great poet

The *Candalaśilā* of Kṣemavar is a drama (Natikā) in five acts The author wrote this play for King Mahipala of Kanauj whose accession to the throne took place in 914 A.D. The plot of this drama is the famous story of King Hariscandra and sage Viśva mitra The style of this drama also is highly artificial

Kṣemīś  
var  
Canda  
kaśikā

Damodaramiśra wrote his *Mahanataka* or *Hanumannataka* in the eleventh century A.D. The drama is found in three recensions separately containing nine, ten and fourteen acts The plot is based on the *Ramayana*, and the dramatist shows considerable skill in versification

Dāmodara  
m a  
M hā  
n ś ka

The date of the *Prabodhacandrodaya*, an allegorical drama, written by Kṛṣṇamiśra is the fourteenth century A.D. The characters of this drama are represented by such characters as Viveka, Manas, Buddha, etc. This drama is a solitary instance where the Quietistic sentiment has been represented on

Kṛṣṇa  
miśra  
Prabodha  
candrodaya

the stage The drama (Nāṭaka) contains *six* acts, and the style is simple

## E

### LESS IMPORTANT DRAMAS

*Bhagavadajjukīya* by Bodhāyanakavi—sometime between the first and the fourth century A D written with the purpose of throwing a fling against Buddhism a *Prahasana* in *two* acts

*Tāpasavatsarājacarita* by Anangahaṁṣa Mātraiāja—Dr Keith fixes the age of the *Ratnāvalī* as the upper limit of the work based on a variation of the theme of Vatsarāja, Padmāvatī and Vāsavadattā

*Lokūnanda* ascribed to Candia or Candiaka(?) who is identified with Candragomin, the grammarian, of the seventh century A D

*Udattarūghava* by Māyurāja who appears to have known Bhavabhūti and is referred to by Rājaśekhara

*Svapnadaśūnana* by Bhīmata—mentioned by Rājaśekhara

*Dharmābhyaudaya* by Meghaprabhācāya—a shadow-drama of unknown date

*Kaṇasundarī* by Bilhana of the eleventh century A D—a *Nāṭikā*

- Citrabhārata* by Ksemendra of the eleventh century A D—a lost drama
- Prabuddharauhinēya* by Rāmabhadra Muni of the twelfth century A D—in six acts
- Āumudimitrānanda* by Rāmacandra of the twelfth century A D—a Prakaraṇa in ten acts
- Latakamelaka* by Sankhadhara Kavirāja of the twelfth century A D—a Prahāsana
- Mudrītakumudacandra* by Yasascandra of the twelfth century A D—a Jiniṣṭic drama
- Nirbhayaḥḥumavyāyoga* by Rāmacandra a prolific Jaina dramatist belonging to the twelfth century A D
- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <i>Kīratārjunīya</i><br><i>Rukminīharana</i><br><i>Triṣṭurādāha</i><br><i>Samudramathana</i><br><i>Karpūracarita &amp;</i><br><i>Hāsyacuḍāmanī</i> | } | by Vatsarāja of the twelfth century A D—the first a Vyāyoga the second an Īhīmiga in four acts the third a Dīma in four acts the fourth a Samava kīra in three acts the fifth a Bhīma and the sixth a farce (Prahāsana) one act |
|--|---|---|
- Parthaparākrama* by Prahlādanadeva of the twelfth century A D—a Vyāyoga
- Prasannarāghava* by Jayadeva (of Berar) of the twelfth century A D—based on the *Rāmāyana*—a Nīṭaka in seven acts
- Harakelīnātaka* by Viśīladeva Viḡraharāja of the twelfth century A D—partially preserved in stone
- Āundamālā* ascribed to Dīgnīga—but according to some written by Dhi

ianāga—quoted in the *Sāhitya-darpana*—not later than the thirteenth century A D

*Dūtūṅgaḍa* by Subhata of the thirteenth century A D a shadow-play

*Hamṁinamadamarḍana* by Jayasimha of the thirteenth century A D—in five acts

*Moharūjaparūjaya* by Yaśahpāla of the thirteenth century A D an allegorical drama in five acts

*Vikrūntakaurava* & *Marthilīkalyūna* } by Hastimalla of the thirteenth century A D in six and five acts respectively

*Pūrvatīparinaya* attributed to Bāna, but allotted to Vāmana Bhaṭṭa Bāna of the fourteenth century A D

*Saugandhikāharana* by Viśvanātha of the fourteenth century A D—a Vyāyoga

*Dhūrtasamūgama* by Kaviśekhara of the fifteenth century A D a Prahasana

*Cartanyacandrodaya* by Kavikānapūra of the sixteenth century A D

*Vidagdhamādhava* & *Lalitāmādhava* } by Rūpagosvāmin of the sixteenth century A D—dealing with the attractive Kṛṣṇa legend—in seven and ten acts respectively

*Kamsavadha* by Śesakṛṣṇa of the seventeenth century A D—in seven acts

*Jānakīparinaya* by Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita of the seventeenth century A D

*Mallikīmṛita* by Uddandin of the seventeenth century A D—a Prakāśana

<i>Adbhutadarpana</i>	by Mahīdeva contemporary of Rīmabhadra—in ten acts
<i>Hūsyūnava</i>	by Jagadīvara of unknown date—a Prahasana
<i>Kautukasarvasa</i>	by Gopinītha of unknown date—a Prahasana
<i>Unmattarūgha</i>	by Bhīṣkara of unknown date—an Auka
<i>Mudharasūdhana</i> (and other plays)	} by Nītyagopīta Kaviratna of the nineteenth century A D
<i>Amaramangala</i>	by Pañcīnana Tīr'aratna of the latter half of the nineteenth century A D and the first half of the twentieth century A D—in eight acts

# REFERENCES

- Ayyar A S P Two plays of Bhīṣa
- Barooah A Bhavabhūti—his place in Sanskrit Literature
- Basu Chandranath Śakuntalītattva
- Basu Devendranath Śakuntalīy Nīṭyakalī
- Belvalkar S K (i) Origin of Indian Drama (The Calcutta Review May 1929)  
(ii) Uttararāmacarita (HOS)
- Bhandarkar R G Mīlatimīdhava
- Buhler G On the authorship of the Rātnīvalī (IA Vol II)
- Chatterjee Bankim Chandra Vividhaprabandha
- Chatterjee N Micchakatika a study
- Devadhar C R Plays ascribed to Bhīṣa their authenticity and merits



- Gajendragadkar, A B The Venīsamhāra—a critical study
- Kāle M R (i) Abhyūñānaśakuntala  
(ii) Uttaraīāmācarita
- Keith A B (i) The Sanskrit Drama  
(ii) JRAS 1909
- Kulkarni, K P Sanskrit Drama and Dramatist
- Konow, S IA Vol. XLIII (on Viśākhadatta)
- Konow, S & Lanmann, C R Karpūramañjarī (HOS)
- Levi, S Le Theatre Indien
- Macdonell A A A History of Sanskrit Literature
- Nauman, G K, & Jackson A V W Prayadarśikā
- Pishiaoti, A K Bhāsa's works—a criticism
- Pusalker, A D Bhāsa a study
- Rapson, E JRAS 1900, (on Viśākhadatta)
- Ridgeway (i) The Origin of Tragedy  
(ii) Dramas and Dramatic Dances of  
Non-European Races
- Śāstrin Ashokanath (i) Prācīnbhārate Dīśya-  
kāvyotpatti Itihāsa (Bhāratavarāsa,  
B S 1333-34)  
(ii) Bhāratīyanāṭyer Vedamūlakatā  
(iii) Bhāratīyanāṭyer Prācīnatā (Māsik  
Vasumatī, B S 1345-46)  
(iv) Abhinayadāpana of Nandikeśvara
- Śāstrin T G Bhāsa's works—a critical study
- Tagore, Rabindranath Prācīn Sāhitya
- Vidyābhūṣana, S C Date of Ratnāvalī
- Weber, A The History of Indian Literature
- Wilson, H H Theatre of the Hindus
- Winternitz, M Some Problems of Indian Literature
- Yajnik, R K The Indian Theatre

## CHAPTER SIX

### LYRIC POETRY

#### A

#### INTRODUCTION

Classical Sanskrit literature is highly rich in lyrical poetry. Though it is a fact that Classical lyric poetry has not produced many works of respectable length and size yet none would deny that its merit is usually of a high order. Lyrical poets have often been successful in depicting the amorous feeling with a few artistic strokes, and their compositions can very well stand comparison with those of foreign poets. The range of lyrical literature in Sanskrit is very wide. It is not confined to the theme of love and amorous feeling only. It includes secular, religious, gnomic and didactic poems and thus offers a variety which is sufficient to remove monotony.

In all lyrical poems dealing with love, Nature plays a very important part. The intimate relation between Nature and Man has not in all probability found a more charming expression in any other branch of

Extent of  
Sanskrit  
lyrics

Nature in  
Sanskrit  
lyrics

literature The lotus and the lily, the Cakra the Cakravāka and the Cātaka, all are inseparably connected with human life and love in its different phases

Prākṛit  
lyrics

It is further to be noted that Prākṛit literature is also highly rich in lyrical poetry The *Sattasaī* or *Gāthāsaptasatī* attributed to Śātavāhana is an outstanding work of this type The book is a collection of *seven hundred* verses in Prākṛit dealing with various phases of the sentiment of love Bāṇa refers to this work in his *Harśacarita* Professor Macdonell wants to place it before 1000 A D If, on the other hand, Hāla or Śātavāhana, to whom the work is attributed, is taken as a king of that name of the Andhra dynasty, the work must be placed early in the Christian era

## B

### GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT OF LYRIC POETRY

Meghadūta

The name of Kālidāsa stands high in the realm of Sanskrit lyrical poetry There is no gainsaying the fact that his *Meghadūta* which has been unsuccessfully imitated

times without number by later poets,<sup>1</sup> is the finest flower of Classical lyric poetry. The lyric has inspired poets like Goethe and Rabindranath who have lavishly bestowed their praise upon this magic personality in literature. Fancifully the poet makes a cloud the messenger of the message of love and admiration to the beloved of a banished Yakṣī, who had been pining for him during the rainy season at Alakā. The work is divided into *two* sections known as the *Purvamegha* and the *Uttaramegha*. The poem is written in Mādhakṛānta metre of gorgeous rhythm like the roar of a July cloud weary under the burden of its water. This is also quite in keeping with the sublime conception of love which, tinged with the burning colour of separation, resembles a black cloud with a silver lining. The stanzas containing the words of message are the most poignant and beautiful in literature and the lyric will ever stand impressed on our memory like a rainbow springing from the earth.

Vedāntadeśika's *Hamsasandēśa* (of the thirteenth century A D) Rūpagosvīmīn's *Hamsadūta* (of the fifteenth century A D) Kṛṣṇānanda's *Padunkadūta* (of the seventeenth century A D) are some of the more well known Dūtakāvya's.

The book has been translated into various European languages and Schiller's *Maria Stuart* owes its origin to it

Rtusamhāra

The *Rtusamhāra* is the second lyric of Kālidāsa. It is a short poem in six cantos describing all the six seasons of the year. It is undoubtedly an earlier production of the poet and though Kālidāsa's authorship of this poem is doubted by many scholars,<sup>1</sup> still we can find in it the aspirations of a budding poet.<sup>2</sup>

Ghata-  
karpara  
Ghatakar-  
para-kāvya

Tradition makes Ghatakarpara one of the nine gems in the court of King Vikramāditya. The *Ghatakarpara-kāvya* after the name of the poet is written in *twenty-two* stanzas. It describes how a young wife in the beginning of the rains sends a cloud-messenger to her absent husband. The poem abounds in Yamakas (figure of speech) for which the author feels proud.

Bhartrhari  
three  
Śatakas

Bhartrhari has to his credit the *three* Śatakas (collection of a hundred verses), viz, (a) the *Śrngāraśataka* (b) the *Nṛtiśataka*

<sup>1</sup> Professors Kielhorn, Buhler, Macdonell, Schroeder and others accept the authorship of Kālidāsa while other scholars entertain a different view.

<sup>2</sup> See, Aurobinda Ghosh, Kālidāsa, Gajendragadkar, *Rtusamhāra*

and (c) the *Vanagyaśataka*. The single authorship of these three poems is doubted by some scholars, but Indian tradition accepts Bhartṛhari to be their author. Bhartṛhari is said to have died in 651 A.D.<sup>1</sup> All the three poems are written in a very lucid style and they have the greatest interest to them for whom they are intended.

Mayūra was a contemporary of Banabhaṭṭa of the seventh century A.D., and reported to be his father-in-law. His *Sūryaśataka*<sup>2</sup> is a religious lyric in *one hundred* verses written in honour of the Sun. Tradition says that the poet was cured of leprosy by composing this eulogy of the Sun.<sup>3</sup>

Mayūra  
Sūryasataka

It is impossible to ascertain the date of Amaru. Vāmana (800 A.D.) is the earliest writer who quotes three verses from the *Amaruśataka*, a lyrical poem in *one hundred*

Amaru  
Amaru  
śataka

<sup>1</sup> It is yet to be decided whether the author of the *Satakas* is the same person as the famous grammarian of that name who wrote the *Vākyapadīya*.

There are other *Sūryaśatakas* by different poets which do not deserve any special mention.

Vajradatta, a Buddhist poet of the ninth century A.D. composed his *Lokesvaraśataka* and was cured of leprosy.

stanzas<sup>1</sup> describing the conditions of women at different stages of life and love. The poet is really gifted and his delineation of sentiments and emotions, especially of love, is superb in character. His style is difficult, but certainly graceful. Amaru's poem has found the widest recognition in the hands of Sanskrit rhetoricians and he is quoted by great thinkers on poetry like Ānandavardhana. The poem has been commented on by more than a dozen writers including Aṣṭanavāman (1215 A D).

Bilhana  
Caurapañ-  
cāsikā

The *Caurapañcāsikā* of Bilhana is a lover's recollections of the sweet company of his beloved. The poem contains *fifty* stanzas. The date of the poet is 1076 A D. 1127 A D. Bhāratacandra, a Bengali poet of the eighteenth century A D, drew the inspiration of his popular poem '*Vidyāsundara*' from this work of Bilhana.

Jayadeva  
Gītagovinda

The Kṛṣṇa-legend found a poetical interpreter in Jayadeva, the last great name in Sanskrit poetry, who flourished in Bengal during the reign of King Lakṣmanasena of the twelfth century A D. He was the son of Bhojadeva of Kendubīlva. His poem, the

<sup>1</sup> The text of the poem has come down to us in *four* recensions which vary widely among themselves.

*GitaGovinda* ranks high amongst Sanskrit lyrics and the poet is a gifted master of poetry. According to Professor Macdonell the poem marks a transitional period between pure lyric and pure drama.<sup>1</sup> Sir William Jones calls it a small pastoral drama while Professor Lassen regards it as a lyrical drama. Leopold von Schroeder would look upon it as a refined Yatra. Both Professors Pischel and Levi place it in the category between song and drama. Some Indian scholars maintain that the poem is a court epic.

Dhoyī, a contemporary of Jayadeva, graced the court of King Lakṣanāsena. Like other Dūtakāvyas, his poem, the *Pavana duta* is written in imitation of the *Meghaduta*.

Dhoyī  
Pavanaduta

### C

#### LESSER LYRIC POEMS AND ANTHOLOGIES

- Śiṅgūratilaka* attributed to Kālidāsa—containing attractive pictures of love in twenty three stanzas
- Bhaktamarastotra* by Mīnatunga probably a contemporary of Bīna or earlier—

<sup>1</sup>It is probable that the poet took as his model popular plays representing incidents from the life of Kṛiṣṇa as the modern Yātrās in Bengal still do.





*Bhallaṣa śataka* by Bhallaṣa a junior contemporary of Ānandavardhana—a gnostic poem

*Mahimnaḥstotra* by Puṣpadanta not later than the ninth century A D—a religious lyric

*Subhūṣitaratnasandoha* } by Amṛtagaṭi of the tenth century A D—all didactic poems  
*Dharmaparīkṣā & Yogasāra* }

*Kṛṣṇakārnāṃbha* } by Bilvamaṅgala or Lalīśuka of the eleventh century A D—highly popular and of graceful style  
*& Vṛndānastuti* }

*Samayamāṅgala* }  
*Kalāṅkīśa Darpaḍalana* } by Kṣemendra of Kāśmīr—all didactic poems  
*Sevayasevāśloka* }  
*Caturvargasaṅgraha & Cārucaryāśataka* }

*Kaṇḍarācanasamuccaya* an anthology—of the eleventh century A D

*Anyokṛmukṭatulasataka* by Sambhu who wrote under Harsa of Kāśmīr (1089 A D—1101 A D)—a gnostic poem

*Āryasaptasatī* by Govardhana a contemporary of Jayadeva—containing seven hundred erotic stanzas—written after the *Sattasatī* of Hīla

*Yogaśūtra* }  
*Vitarūgaśloka & Vahṇīraśloka* } by Hemacandra of the twelfth century A D—very good didactic lyric poems sometimes reminding us of the poems of Bhartṛhari

*Saduktīrṇāṃbha* an anthology by Śrīdhara of the twelfth century A D

logy aided by environment and the course of events. The popular Indian view on worldly life and the teachings of Indian philosophical and religious works are surely responsible for fostering a feeling of apathy towards making any serious attempt at recording facts and dwelling on them.

The beginnings of Indian history are to be traced to the Purāṇas which contain amidst vast masses of religious and social matters, accounts of genealogies which are the very germs of history.

In Prākṛit, however, there is a very important historical work called the *Gaudaraho* which was written by Vākpati. It celebrates the defeat of one Gauda king by Yaśovarman, King of Kanauj, the poet's patron, who was again overthrown by Lalitāditya Mukatāpīda, King of Kāśhmīr. Vākpati is a follower of the Gauda style and uses long compounds. His date has approximately been fixed in the eighth century A.D., and he is mentioned along with Bhavabhūti.

## B

### GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF HISTORICAL WORKS

Padmagupta also known as Paṇimāla, wrote his *Navasāhasāṅkacarita* in 1050

Earliest  
Historical  
works

Vākpati  
Gaudaraho

A D The book contains *eighteen* cantos and describes the winning of Princess Sūprabha and also alludes to the history of Śindhuraja Navasīrasānī of Malva

Padma  
gupta  
Navasīrasānī  
śāncacarita

Sandhyākaranandin's *Ramapālacarita* describes through *double entendre* the story of Rama and also the history of King Ramapala of Bengal who recovered his ancestral home from Bhima, a Kuvuta chief and conquered Mithila Sandhyākaranandin flourished during 1057 A D — 1087 A D

Sandhyā  
karanan  
din Rama  
pālacarita

Bilhana's patron was Vilāmaditya VI a Calukya king of Kalyāṇa who flourished during 1076 A D — 1127 A D Bilhana glorified his patron by writing his *Vilāmakadevīcarita* in *eighteen* cantos Bilhana was more a poet than a historian and his work abounds in numerous imaginary and fanciful descriptions

Bilhana  
Vikramān  
kadevī  
carita

Kalhana is the best of Indian historians He wrote his *Rajataranginī* in 1100 A D Kalhana has derived materials for his book from older sources including the *Nīlāmata-purāṇa* The *Rajataranginī* is the only reliable book on the history of Kāśhmīr after the death of King Harsha when the country passed through stormy bloody days Though a historian Kalhana has the rare

Kalhana  
Rajataran  
gin

gifts of a poet, and his book is a wonderful admixture of poetic fancy and historical facts. According to European scholars, it is the only work in Sanskrit literature which approaches history to a certain extent.

Hemacandra who flourished during 1088 A.D. 1172 A.D. wrote his *Kumārapālacarita* or *Dvyāśrayakāvya* in honour of Kumārapāla, King of the Cālukyas.

The anonymous *Prthvīrājaviṇaya* celebrates the victories of King Prthvīrāja over Shihāb-ud-dīn Ghori in 1191 A.D.

Hema-  
candra  
Kumāra-  
pālacarita

Prthvīrāja-  
viṇaya

## C

### MINOR HISTORICAL WORKS

*Prabhāvākacarita* by Prabhācandra and revised by Pradyumnasūri (1277 A.D.)—regarded as a continuation of Hemacandra's *Parīśista-parvan*—containing the life-history of twenty-two Jaina teachers—a semi-historical work.

*Rājendrakavāṇī* by Śambhu who wrote in honour of Harsadeva of Kāśhmīr (1089 A.D. 1101 A.D.)

*Kīrtikāumudī* } by Somēśvaradatta (1179 A.D. —  
& *Śaṭsava* } 1262 A.D.)—more in the form of  
panegyrics—the latter written in  
fifteen cantos

- Sukṛtasanakīrtana* by Arisimha of the thirteenth century A D—a panegyric in eleven cantos
- Jagadūcarita* by Sarvānanda of unknown date—a panegyric of a Jaina who rendered help to his townsfolk at the time of the famine of 1256 8 A D in Gujarāt
- Prabandhacintāmanī* by Merutunga of the fourteenth century A D—a quasi historical biographical work
- Prabandhaḥosa* by Rājasekhara of the fourteenth century A D—containing the life stories of Jaina teachers poets kings and other personages
- Kīrtilata* by Vidyāpati of the fourteenth century A D

### REFERENCES

- Keith A B A History of Sanskrit Literature  
 Macdonell A A A History of Sanskrit Literature  
 Weber A The History of Indian Literature  
 Winternitz M A History of Indian Literature  
 Vol II

# CHAPTER EIGHT

## PROSE LITERATURE

A

### INTRODUCTION

History of  
Sanskrit  
Prose  
literature

In matters of expression the Indian mind has always preferred poetry to prose. Commentaries and lexicons were written in verse, and sometimes conversation even was carried on in metre. The major portion of Vedic literature is in metre. So the peculiarity of the Indian mind is the cause of the dearth of prose literature in Sanskrit. In the *Kṛṣṇa-Yajur-veda*, however, we come across the earliest specimen of prose-writing. The prose of the *Atharvaveda* should also be considered in connection with the study of the history and development of prose-writings in ancient India. The prose of the Brāhmaṇas is simple yet elegant, and the prose of the Sūktā literature is more or less in the form of a message we usually send in a telegram. All these, however, cannot give us any standard of writing which may be imitated with profit. The prose portions of the *Mahābhārata*, and of the Pūraṇas such as, the *Viṣṇu* and the

*Bhagavata* and of the medical compilations of Cuaka and Susruta should also be mentioned. The earliest standard of prose writing is to be found in Patañjali's *Mahabhasya* which is noted for its grace, vigour and elegance and in it we find a perfection of Brahmanical prose. The prose of explanatory treatises or commentaries offers a good specimen of Sanskrit composition. Thus the writings of Sabarisaṁin on the *Mimamsasutras* of Vatsyāyana on the *Nyayasutras* the commentaries of Saṅkara on the *Brahmasutras* and the *Upaniads* and the explanatory work of Medhātithi on *Manusmṛti* are instances to the point. Besides all these, there is the prose of the early dramatic literature which should necessarily demand a careful study. In fact the extent of prose writing is not very small but when it is said that it is insignificant the greater extent of poetic compositions is considered.

Though the beginnings of Sanskrit prose writings may be traced to a very dim antiquity the extant works on prose literature are of a comparatively late date. The extant prose literature may be divided into two broad classes —romance and fable.

It appears that in early Classical Sans

Romance &  
Fable



Ākhyāyikā  
& Kathā

but there were numerous types of prose romances, the two most important among them being Ākhyāyikā and Kathā. But as early as the seventh century A.D., Dandin writes in his *Kāvyādarśa* that there is no vital point of difference in the nature of these two types of prose compositions and he regards them as the different names of one and the same species. Amarasimha, the lexicographer, however, distinguishes between the two, Ākhyāyikā having a historical basis and Kathā being a purely poetic creation.

Origin of  
Fable  
literature

The origin of Indian fable literature must be traced back to the earliest times in the life of Vedic Indians. The tales current among the people were later on used for a definite purpose, and the didactic fable became a mode of inculcating useful knowledge.

## B

### ROMANCE

Dandin  
age & home

There is a great difference of opinion amongst scholars regarding the age of Dandin. It is held on the evidence of the *Kāvyādarśa*, a well-known work on rhetorical

canons by the poet, that he flourished after Pravarasena. According to the *Rajatarangini*, Pravarasena ruled Kāshmir in the sixth century A.D. Thus Pravarasena was probably the author of the poem *Setubandha*. The relation between Dandin and Bhāmaha, another rhetorician, has created a great controversy. Some scholars are inclined to believe that Dandin has criticized the views of Bhāmaha while others entertain the opposite view. There is some controversy again with regard to the relation of Dandin to Bhatta, the grammarian-poet. Some scholars are definitely of opinion that Dandin used the *Bhaṭṭilīlāya*. It is, however, presumed that he flourished in the seventh century A.D. From the internal evidence furnished by both the *Daśakumaracarita* and the *Harvyadara* it appears that Dandin was an inhabitant of South India. He was fairly acquainted with the Kāveri, the Andhras and the Colas.

Dandin's *Daśakumaracarita*, a work of the Akhyāyika type, describes the exploits of eight princes Rajavāhana and others. As the name of the work implies, it should have contained accounts of ten princes. The stories of the other two princes are given in

Daśakum  
racarita  
contents &  
character

the prelude (*Pūṇapīṭhulā*) and the incomplete story of one of the princes (*Viśanta*) has been incorporated in the sequel (*Uttara-pīṭhulā*), which two chapters seem to be the work of a different hand. The romance reflects admirably the social conditions in which the author lived and where the standard of morality was markedly poor. Dandin's writings usually conform to the Vaidarbha style.

Subandhu appears to have been earlier than Bāṇabhaṭṭa who has referred to the former's *Vāsavadattā* in his introduction to the *Kādambarī*. In a passage in the *Vāsavadattā* Subandhu laments over the death of Vikramāditya. This has led scholars to surmise that after the death of Candragupta II of the Gupta dynasty who assumed the title of Vikramāditya, there was a civil war in the country, and Subandhu was aggrieved by upholding the losing cause. This theory, however, is not generally accepted. From two passages in the *Vāsavadattā*, European scholars find references to Uddyotakara, the great writer on Nyāya, and the *Bauddhasaṅgatyālankāra* of Dharmakīrti. If the allusions are correct, Subandhu may be placed in the beginning of the seventh century A.D.

The theme of Subandhu's *Vasavadatta* is the love story of Prince Kandarpaketa and Princess Vasavadatta. The playful imagination of the poet conceives how on one night the prince dreams about a beautiful princess and starts in quest of her. Meanwhile the princess having dreamt of Prince Kandarpaketa sends one of her personal attendants in search of him. Kandarpaketa in course of his travels comes to learn about Vasavadatta from the conversation of a pair of birds. He arrives at Pataliputra and is united with Vasavadatta. But the king Vasavadatta's father wants to give her away to another prince. Thereupon the two leave the palace on a magic steed and go to the Vindhya. One night they fall asleep but in the morning the prince gets up and is surprised not to find Vasavadatta by his side. He commences a vigorous search and at last discovers her in the hermitage of the sage. She is turned into a stone and the prince revives her by his touch.

Story of  
*Vasavadatta*

The poet is a master of a style which is marked by a preponderant use of alliteration.

Style

Barabhatta is undoubtedly the greatest of Indian prose writers. Fortunately the

date of Bāna is one of the surest planks in the tottering edifice of ancient Indian chronology. Bāna has to his credit the *Harṣacarita* and the *Kādambarī* which are respectively an *Akhyāyikā* and a *kathā*.

In his *Harṣacarita*, Bāna glorifies his patron, King Harsa who flourished during 606 A.D. - 647 A.D. In the first and second chapters of this incomplete book Bāna gives an account of his genealogy and early life which reveals him as a great traveller.

Bāna makes lavish use of his poetic imagination in relating the story of *Kādambarī* which also he could not complete. The theme of this book is the fascinating love-story of Candīpīda and Kādambarī in their several births. Running parallel with the main story we also find the love-episode of Pundarīka and Mahāśvetā. The romance relates how the Moon-god being cursed by Pundarīka who was pining for Mahāśvetā, was born on earth as Candīpīda and fell in love with Kādambarī, the Gandhārva princess. Pundarīka also cursed by the Moon-god was born on earth as Vaiśampāyana, the friend of Candīpīda. In this birth also both Candīpīda and Vaiśampāyana gave up their lives and were again born as King

Bāna  
age &  
works

Harṣa-  
carita

Kādambarī

Sūdirāla and the puroit respectively. Happily in this birth they were all reunited.

Much has been said of Bāṇa's style. Western critics describe it as a big forest where all access is prohibited because of the luxuriant undergrowth of words. But Indian scholars have the highest admiration for Bāṇa and his style, and it would not be an exaggeration to say that his style has been regarded by Indian scholars as the standard style of prose. Superb is Bāṇa's power of description and he wields the language with the greatest ease.

Style

## C

### FABLE

The short stories in Indian literature may be classed under *three* different heads, viz. the popular tales, the beast fables and the fairy tales. The popular tales again may be broadly sub-divided into Buddhist and non-Buddhist.<sup>1</sup>

Classifica-  
tion of  
fables

The Buddhist popular tales are the Pāli Jātakas which were current among the

Buddhist  
popular  
tales

<sup>1</sup> The fable literature of the Jains is extremely rich. But only a few works are written in pure Sanskrit.

Buddhists from the earliest times Apart from these Jātaka stories there are some Buddhist Sanskrit works on popular stories (already referred to in a previous chapter)

Gunādhyā's *Bṛhatkathā* is an outstanding work among non-Buddhistic popular tales The work was written in Pāṣāṇī Prākṛit, a dialect spoken in the north western parts of India The work is now unfortunately lost to us, but the story has been preserved in *three* Sanskrit works, viz, (1) Budhasvāmin's *Ślohasaṃgraha* (composed between the eighth and the ninth century A D), (2) Ksemendia's *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* (1037 A D) and (3) Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara* (1063-81 A D) According to Dr Keith the *Ślohasaṃgraha* (which is found only in a fragment of *twenty-eight* chapters and some 4539 verses) is a genuine translation of Gunādhyā's work and he holds that both Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara* (containing 21,388 verses) and Ksemendia's *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* (containing about 7500 verses) are not from the original *Bṛhatkathā* Nevertheless, the *Bṛhatkathā* is mentioned as early as the seventh century A D in Dandin's *Kāvyaadarśa*, and Dr Buhler has placed the

'Gunādhyā's  
Bṛhatkathā  
& works  
based on it

work in the first or the second century A.D. Dr Keith suggests that it was written not later than the fourth century A.D. The importance of the *Bṛhatkatha* can never be overestimated. As a perpetual source of inspiration the *Bṛhatkatha* occupies an important place in Indian literature, a place next only to that of the two Great Epics, the *Ramāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*.

The *Pancatantra* by Viśnuṣarman is an important work on the beast fable literature, and it is said that the book has an earlier basis called the *Tantrikhyāṇika* now lost to us. The work is written in five books in clear lucid style with an admixture of prose and verse. It alludes to Candavi and follows Kautilya's *Arthaśāstra*. The importance of this work may be judged from the fact that it was translated into Pahlavi and Syriac in the sixth century A.D., into Arabic in the eighth century A.D., into Hebrew in the eleventh century A.D., into Spanish in the thirteenth century A.D., and into Latin and English in the sixteenth century A.D.

The *Hitopadeśa* is another work on beast fable literature written by one Narayana Pandita. The author imitates the style of Viśnuṣarman and the method of arrangement

Viśnu  
sarman  
Pancatantra

Narayana  
Hitopadeśa



ment is entirely the same in both the works. The author lived in the court of King Dhavalacandra of whom we know little. A manuscript of this work is dated the fourteenth century A D. According to Dr. Keith its date cannot be earlier than the eleventh century A D, as a verse of Rudrabhatta is cited in the book. Moreover a Jama scholar made use of it in 1199 A D in order to produce a new version.

Another work of the beast-fable class is Śrīvāsa's *Kathākantuka* written in the fifteenth century A D.

Under the fairy-tale literature we may class the following three books of unknown date. The *Vetālapañcaviṃśati* attributed to Śivadāsa and the *Śimhāsana-dvātriṃśikā* are probably of the Buddhist origin. Both the books are based on the character of a fictitious king named Vikrama. The *Śukasaptati* of unknown origin and date is a collection of *seventy* tales which the parrot narrates to the mistress who was about to play false to her husband.

Śrīvāsa  
Kathā-  
kantuka

Vetālapañ-  
caviṃśati,  
Śimhāsana-  
dvātriṃśikā  
& Śuka-  
saptati

## D

## LESSER PROSE TALES

- Upamitibhāṭaprapaṇcā kathā* by Siddha or Siddha  
r : a Juna monk of 906 A D —  
written in prose interspersed with  
verses—a didactic tale
- Katharnava* by Śivādīśa—containing *thirty five*  
tales chiefly of fools and thieves—  
of unknown date but appearing as  
a late work
- Purusaparīkṣā* by Vidyāpati belonging to the latter  
part of the fourteenth century  
A D—containing *forty four* stories
- Bhojaprabandha* by Ballāṣena of the sixteenth  
century A D—containing legends  
of the court of King Bhoja
- Campakāśreṣṭhikathunaka* } by Jinakīrti of the  
& *Palagopūlakathunaka* } fifteenth century A D
- Kathūkosa* of unknown date—written in bad Sanskrit
- Samyaktalāmunḍī* by an unknown author—pro-  
bably of a later date

## REFERENCES

- Keith A B A History of Sanskrit Literature  
Macdonell A A A History of Sanskrit Literature  
Weber A The History of Indian Literature

# CHAPTER NINE

## CAMPŪ LITERATURE

### A

#### INTRODUCTION

Composition in mixed prose and verse in Sanskrit is called Campū. Though the admixture of prose and verse can be traced even in Vedic literature, specially in the Brāhmanas, still the origin of Campū is to be sought in its immediate predecessors, the fables and the romances. Already in the writings of Subandhu and Bāna and in some inscriptions we find stray verses, until very lately the mingling of prose and verse became a singular characteristic of a different section of literature. But it is a curious fact that no Campū older than the tenth century A D is extant, though Professor Oldenberg has discovered something like Campū in the *Jātakamālā* of Āiśāsūra.

Campū  
character  
& age

### B

#### SOME IMPORTANT WORKS

*Nalacampū* & ) by Tivikīramabhatta of the tenth  
*Madūlasūcampū*) century A D

- Yaśastilaka* by Somadeva a Digambara Jaina of the middle of the tenth century A D —describing the conversion of King Mīridatta
- Tīlakamañjarī* by Dhanapāla a Jaina who wrote about 970 A D
- Jīvandharacampū* by Haricandra not earlier than 900 A D
- Pamāyanacampū* attributed to Bhojajāja and Laksanabhata
- Bhāratacampu* by Ananta of unknown date
- Udayasundarikathā* by Soddhala of 1040 A D —highly influenced by Bīna
- Gopālacampū* by Jivagosvīmun of the sixteenth century A D
- Śahāsudhākaracampū* by Nārīyana of the seven teenth century A D
- Śankaracetovīlāsacampū* by Śankara—a very late work

## REFERENCES

- Keith A B A History of Sanskrit Literature
- Winternitz M A History of Indian Literature Vol II

The most popular of all the schools of grammar is that of Pāṇini who has mentioned no less than *sixty four* names of previous grammarians among which Kāśya, pa Āpīśa, Gārgya, Gālava, Sakatayana Sena and Sphotayana may be cited

Pāṇini &  
his prede-  
cessors

## B

### PĀNINI SCHOOL

Scholars vary widely among themselves in determining the age of Pāṇini Professor Goldstucker places him in the eighth century B C, while Professors Max Muller and Weber are of opinion that he belonged to the fourth century B C His grammar, the *Aṣṭadhyāyī* is a work in *eight* chapters each of which contains *four* sections The arrangement of the rules is highly scientific, economy being the most outstanding characteristic

Pāṇini  
Aṣṭadhyāy

informs us that the Andra school was supplanted by Pāṇini the author of the *Aṣṭadhyāyī* This has led Dr Burnell to conclude that the Andra school of grammar is the oldest in India It should be noted however that neither Pāṇini nor Patañjali mentions Andra as a grammarian It is therefore argued by some that the Andra school is post Pāṇiniya in date though pre Pāṇiniya in substance

Kātyāyana who is known as the Vāittikakāra came after Pāṇini and his age is usually assigned to the third century B C. The Vāittikas are undoubtedly 'supplementary rules' which were framed by Kātyāyana to justify certain new forms which crept into the language after Pāṇini had written his Sūtras. But Kātyāyana did not only supplement the rules of Pāṇini but also rejected some of them which were deemed unnecessary. In some cases again he improved upon the text of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* to meet the demands of a living language.

Patañjali who is regarded as the last of the 'three great sages', lived during the reign of King Pusyamitra (or Puspamitra) of the Śunga dynasty. His date is one of the few definite landmarks in the whole range of early Indian literature. Patañjali earned for himself a rare reputation and his views were referred to by later schools of rival philosophers with utmost respect and reverence. Patañjali resorted to some technical devices whereby he could effectively extend the scope of the original Sūtras of Pāṇini and did not on that account venture any addition like Kātyāyana. It must, however, be said that he, too, rejected quite a good

number of the Sūtras of Panini. The prose of Patañjali's *Mahabhasya*, is inimitable and marked by the qualities of grace, brevity and perspicuity.

Next after the three great sages mentioned above, one must remember the name of Bhartrhari who is often wrongly identified with Bhatti, the grammarian poet, and who is in all probability referred to by I tsing when he says that a great grammarian died in 651 A.D. Bhartrhari is known as the author of the *Vakyapadiya* (in two chapters), the *Prakura* and a commentary on Patañjali's *Mahabhāṣya* fragments of which are preserved in the Berlin library. It may be proved on the strength of the internal evidence furnished by the *Vakyapadiya* that the grammarian lived earlier than the seventh century A.D. The opening chapter of the *Vakyapadiya* discusses the philosophy of Sanskrit grammar. In the second chapter and the *Prakura*, he discusses various topics of Sanskrit grammar.

Vāmana and Jayāditya are the two Buddhist writers who wrote the *Haṁsa* a commentary on the Sūtras of Panini. I tsing informs us that Jayāditya died about

Bhartrhari  
Vakya  
padiya and  
other works

Vāmana &  
Jayāditya  
Kāśikā

660 A D The object of Vāmana and Jayāditya was to incorporate in the system of Pāṇini all the improvements made by Candragomin. The *Kāśikā* is usually known as the *Vṛtti*.

Jinendrabuddhi, a Bengali Buddhist, wrote an excellent and exhaustive commentary called the *Nyāsa* or the *Kāśikāṣṇanāpāṇīkā*, on the *Kāśikā* of Vāmana and Jayāditya. Jinendrabuddhi is referred to by Bhāmaha, the rhetorician, and as such he cannot be later than the eighth century A D.

Kaivya is one of the most authoritative writers affiliated to the school of Pāṇini. His commentary, the *Pradīpa*, on the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali, is an invaluable treatise. It is believed that Kaivya wrote in the eleventh century A D.

Haradatta, the author of the *Padamañjarī*, a commentary of the *Kāśikā*, is well-known for his independent views which more often than not contradict the statements of Patañjali. Haradatta is quoted by Mallinātha while he himself quotes Māgha. It is assumed that Haradatta flourished in the twelfth century A D.

The *Astādhyāyī* of Pāṇini was remoulded



by later grammarians belonging to the school of Panini who unrunged the Sūtras of Panini according to the topics selected for discussion Rāmācandra who flourished in the first half of the fifteenth century A.D. wrote his *Prāṇyālaumudī* which is supposed to be the model for Bhaṭṭoji's *Siddhāntālaumudī*. The most famous commentary the *Prasada*, on the *Prāṇyālaumudī* was written by Viṭṭhalācārya in the first half of the sixteenth century A.D.

Rāma  
candra  
Prākṛyā  
kaumudī

The *Siddhāntālaumudī* of Bhaṭṭoji is a recast of the Sūtras of Panini in the topical method. Bhaṭṭoji flourished in seventeenth century A.D. Bhaṭṭoji himself wrote a commentary on his *Siddhāntālaumudī* which is called the *Prāudhamanorama*. His *Sabdālaustubha* is an authoritative commentary on Pāṇini's *Aśādhya*. It is true that Bhaṭṭoji's reputation as an authority on Sanskrit grammar is enviable. The most famous commentary on the *Siddhāntālaumudī* is the *Tattva-bodhinī* by Jñānendra Sarasvatī of the eighteenth century A.D. The *Balamanorama* of Vāsudeva is an easy commentary on the *Siddhāntālaumudī*.

Bhaṭṭoji  
Siddhānta  
kaumudī &  
other works

Nāgesabhaṭṭa was a versatile genius of the

eighteenth century A D who wrote treatises not only on grammar but also on Yoga, Alāṅkāra and other subjects. Among his important works in grammar are the *Uddyota*, a commentary on Kaiyata's *Pradīpa*, the *Brhacchabdendusekhara* and the *Laghuśabdendusekhara* (both commentaries on Bhattoji's *Siddhāntakaumudī*) and the *Paribhāṣendusekhara*, a collection of Paribhāṣās in connection with Pāṇini's grammar. The *Vaiyākaranasiddhāntamañjūsā* (*Brhat* and *Laghu*) is another outstanding work which has discussed various topics of Sanskrit grammar.<sup>1</sup>

Varadarāja, a very recent writer popularized his name by making abridgements of the *Siddhāntakaumudī*. His two books, the *Laghusiddhāntakaumudī* and the *Madhyasiddhāntakaumudī* are widely read by all beginners of Sanskrit grammar.

### C

## OTHER IMPORTANT SCHOOLS OF GRAMMAR

Candragomin flourished in the middle of the fifth century A D. Bhartṛhari in his

<sup>1</sup> According to the tradition which we have been privileged to inherit and which comes down uninterruptedly from Nāgeśabhatta, the *Paramalaghumamañjūsā* is not the work of Nāgeśa.

*Valyapadīya* refers to the Candia school of grammarians. The object of Candia grammar was to rearrange with marked brevity the system of Pāṇini. The Candia grammar however gained much popularity and was widely commented upon. The commentaries are now preserved mostly in Tibetan translations.

Candia  
school

According to Professor Pāṭhāk Jīnendra flourished in the latter part of the fifth century A.D. Jīnendra holds originality inasmuch as he condenses Pāṇini and the Vārtikas. Two main commentaries on this grammar have been preserved—one by Abhayamandī (750 A.D.) and another called *Sabdarnavacandīka* by Somadeva.

Jainendra  
school

Śikāṭayana the founder of a school after his name should not be confused with the ancient Śikāṭayana mentioned by Pāṇini. Śikāṭayana wrote his *Sabdantusāna* in the first quarter of the ninth century A.D. *Amoghavṛtti* is another work of this author. Śikāṭayana has based his work upon Pāṇini, Kaṭyāyana and Jīnendra. Śikāṭayana is also credited with the authorship of (i) the *Paribhasasūtras* (ii) the *Ganapadha* (iii) the *Dhatupadha* (iv) the *Unadisūtras* and (v) the *Lingantusāna*.

Śikāṭayana  
school

Hemacandra, the prolific Jaina writer, wrote his *Śabdānuśāsana* in the eleventh century A D The book consists of more than *four thousand* Sūtras, and is a compilation rather than an original work Hemacandra himself wrote a commentary of his book known as *Śabdānuśāsana-bīhadīrti*

Saivaverman is the author of the *Kātantrasūtras* otherwise known as the Kaumāra and the Kālāpa The beginnings of this school go to the early centuries of the Christian era There are, however, evidences of later interpolations in the *Kātantrasūtras* Saivaverman's views are in many places different from those of Pāṇini Dugasinha wrote his famous *Ṛtti* on this grammar not later than the ninth century A D Dugasinha's *Ṛtti* was commented by Vaidhamāna in the eleventh century A D Prthvidhara wrote a sub-commentary on Vaidhamāna's work The Kātantra school has been highly popular in Bengal and Kāshmi

Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya is the author of the *Sāṃsvatapiṭakavyā*, who flourished in the middle of the fourteenth century A D Brevity of expression is a characteristic of

this school. Some of the many commentators on the *Sarasiatapralīya*, are Puñjara, Amṛtabhāratī Ksemendī and others.

Vopadeva wrote his *Mugdhabodha* in the thirteenth century A.D. Vopadeva's style is brief and simple. His technical terms in many places differ from those of Panini. Rāmānandagiri is the most celebrated commentator of this grammar.

**Mugdha  
bodha  
school**

Kāmadāśarī wrote his *Samlīpitasāra* in the thirteenth century A.D. The work has eight sections and the illustrations have been taken from the *Bhaṭṭalīya*. The *Samlīpitasāra* underwent a thorough revision in the hand of Jambuvandini who wrote a commentary called the *Rasavati*. This grammar is widely read in Western Bengal.

**Jaumara  
school**

The author of the *Supadma* is Padmanābha who flourished in the fourteenth century A.D. This system of grammar, like many other systems, is based on Panini. Padmanābha himself wrote a commentary known as the *Supadmapañjalī*.

**Saupadma  
school**

## D

### SECTARIAN SCHOOLS OF GRAMMAR

In recent centuries there flourished some grammarians who wanted to make grammar

the vehicle of religion. This tendency was already present in Vopadeva. Rūpagosvāmin wrote his *Harināmāmṛta* in the fifteenth century A D. The names of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā are used as actual technical terms of grammar. Jivagosvāmin wrote a grammar of the same name. A third Vaisnava grammar named *Caitanyāmṛta* is mentioned by Professor Colebrooke.

## E

### SOME IMPORTANT WORKS ON GRAMMER

*Duṅghatavṛtti* by Śāriṇadeva—a Bengali Buddhist of the twelfth century A D—dealing with derivations of difficult words

*Bhāsāvṛtti* by Puruṣottamadeva of the twelfth century A D—a commentary on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (sections on Vedic accent are left out)

*Gaṇaratnamahodadhī* by Vaidhamāna in 1140 A D

*Paribhāṣāvṛtti* by Śiṇadeva—a collection of *paribhāṣās* with their explanation

*Dhātupradīpa* by Maitreyakṣita who is later than Hemacandra—containing a list of roots and their uses

*Dhātuvṛtti* by Mādhava, son of Sāyana—written after the model of the *Dhātupradīpa*

*Vaiyākāṇanabhūṣana* & *Vaiyākāṇanabhūṣanasūtra* } by Kaundabhatta ne-  
 phew of Bhaṭṭoji—deal-  
 ing with philosophical  
 and other points of  
 Sanskrit grammar

*Śabdaratna* by Haṇḍikṣita grandson of Bhaṭṭoji  
 and teacher of Nīgeṣa—a commen-  
 tary on the *Prauhāmanoram*

*Praudhamanoramāḥucamardini* by Panditarīja  
 Jagannātha the great rhetorician  
 —a criticism of the *Prauhā-  
 manoramā*

## REFERENCES

- Belvalkar S. H. Systems of Sanskrit Grammar  
 Keith A. B. A History of Sanskrit Literature

# CHAPTER ELEVEN

## POETICS AND DRAMATURGY

### A

#### INTRODUCTION

The literature on poetics and dramaturgy is conspicuously rich in Classical Sanskrit. Many able thinkers have written important works both on poetics and dramaturgy, and it is also a fact that one and the same author has written on both these subjects of kindred nature. Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* is the earliest known treatise on poetics and dramaturgy. The date of this monumental composition has been variously assigned by scholars to the period between the second century B.C. and third century A.D. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* shows unmistakable proofs of a systematic tradition which has preceded it by at least a century. Bharata has been held in high esteem by all later writers on poetics and his work has continued to be a source of inspiration to them.

With the progress of years there arose four main schools of poetics which maintain different views with regard to the essential characteristics of poetry. Thus from time



to time, *Alankāra* (Figure), *Rīti* (Style), *Rasa* (Aesthetic pleasure) and *Dhvani* (Suggestion) have been declared to be the essential factors of poetry. The *Dhvani* school, however, has grown to be the most important of all other schools of *Alankāra* literature. *Ānandavardhana*, the author of the *Dhvanīśloka* is known to be the pioneer of this school and it has been for his commentator *Abhinavagupta* to bring out the importance of the doctrine of *Dhvani* through his lasting contributions.<sup>1</sup>

*Bhāmaha* is one of the earliest rhetoricians to take up a systematic discussion of poetic embellishments after *Bharata's* treatment of figures. *Bhāmaha* flourished in all probability in the seventh century A.D. His only work the *Kāvyālaṅkāra* contains six chapters. In his definition of poetry *Bhāmaha* has accorded equal status to 'word and import, though he has devoted more attention to the former.

*Udbhata* wrote his *Alaṅkārasamgraha* in

<sup>1</sup> According to modern scholars a comparatively late work on Indian poetics is the *Aganipurāna* where in as many as eleven chapters a comprehensive and authoritative information about the various schools of poetics known to the author is available.

(1) *Alaṅkāra* school

*Bhāmaha*  
*Kāvyālaṅkāra*

the latter half of the eighth century A.D. The work is a collection of verses defining *forty-one* figures and contains *six* chapters. In his treatment of figures Udbhata has followed in the line of Bhāmaha.<sup>1</sup>

Rudrāṭa wrote his *Kāvyaṭīkā* in the first quarter of the ninth century A.D. The work which is in *sixteen* chapters, deals mainly with figures of poetry. In his treatment of figures Rudrāṭa seems to have been the follower of a tradition different from that of Bhāmaha and Udbhata. Of the three commentators of Rudrāṭa, Namisādhu appears to be the most important.

Dandin, the author of the *Kāvyaadarśa*, is the precursor to the Rīti school which was developed by Vāmana. Though Dandin is usually assigned to the seventh century A.D., still the mutual priority of Bhāmaha and Dandin is a disputed point in the history of Sanskrit poetics. Dandin appears to have been greatly influenced by the Alankāra school. His most outstanding con-

<sup>1</sup> Though Udbhata belongs to the Alankāra school, his well-known commentator Pratihārenduśāra, a pupil of Mukulabhattacharya, is a follower of the Rasa school. Pratihārenduśāra is assigned to the first half of the tenth century A.D.

tribution to poetics is the concept of Guna. In his definition of poetry Dandin gives more importance to the word element than to the sense element. The most authoritative commentator of the *Kavyadarśa* is Tarunavācaspati.

Vaṃana who flourished in the latter half of the eighth century A.D., wrote his *Kavya-lanlārasūtra* in five chapters and twelve sections in which he boldly asserted that Rīti is the soul of poetry. The ten Gunas are important in so far as they constitute Rīti. The *Kamadhenu*, a late work by Gopendīa Tīppa Bhūpāla, is a lucid commentary on the *Kavyalanlārasūtra*.

Vaṃana  
Kāvyālan-  
kārasūtra

The Rāsa school originated from the interpretations by different commentators of Bharata's aphorism on Rāsa. Lollāta who is known to be the earliest interpreter, flourished in the eighth century A.D. The work of Lollāta is unfortunately lost to us, though a review of his opinion is found in the *Abhinavabharatī* of Abhinavagupta and the *Kavyaprakāśa* of Mammata.

(11) Rāsa  
school

Lollāta

Another interpreter is Śrī Śāṅkuka who has criticized the views of Lollāta. The work of Śrī Śāṅkuka also is lost to us. He is believed to be a junior contemporary of Lollāta.

Śrī Śāṅkuka

Bhattanāyaka is the most celebrated commentator of the Rasa school. He is said to have flourished between the last quarter of the ninth century A D and the beginning of the tenth century A D His work, the *Hṛdayadarpana*, is unfortunately lost to us Bhattanāyaka has rejected the views of Lollata and Śīlī-Śankuka It is interesting to note that Bhattanāyaka has recognized *two* additional powers of word, viz., the power of generalization (*bhāva-hatva*) by which the meaning is made intelligible to the audience and the power of *bhōjakatva* which enables the audience to relish the enjoyment of the poem

The doctrine of Dhvani according to which 'suggestion' is held to be the essence of poetry, was formulated by Ānandavaiḍhana in his *Dhvanyāloka* in the middle of the ninth century A D Ānandavaiḍhana informs us that the doctrine of Dhvani is very old, the dim beginnings of which are lost in oblivion According to Ānandavaiḍhana, word is not only endowed with the *two* powers of denotation (*śakti*) and implication (*lakṣanā*) but also of suggestion (*vyañjanā*) Through the power of sugges-

tion, either a subject, or a figure or a sentiment is revealed

The views of Ānandavardhana found in large and definite shape in the writings of his erudite commentator Abhinavagupta who flourished at the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century A D. Abhinavagupta has to his credit two important commentaries on poetics which may be looked upon as independent treatises and these are the *Locana* on the *Dhvanyaloka* of Ānandavardhana and the *Abhinavabhāratī* on the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata. Abhinavagupta thinks that all suggestion must be of sentiment for the suggestion of subject or that of figure may be ultimately reduced to the suggestion of sentiment

Abhinava  
gupta  
Locana &  
Abhinava  
bhāratī

## B

### WORKS ON POETICS & DRAMATURGY

*Abhidhāvṛttimātrikā* by Mukulabhaṭṭa who is generally assigned to the period between the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth century A D — a grammatico rhetorical work

*Kāvya-mīmāṃsā* by Rājasekhara of the tenth century A D — written in eighteen

chapters— a practical hand-book for poets

*Vakroktijīvita* by Kuntala or Kuntaka who flourished in the middle of the tenth century A D and belonged to a reactionary school to Dhvani upholding Vakrokti (figurative speech) as the essence of poetry (The Vakrokti school is an off-shoot of the older Alankāra school)

*Daśarūpaka* by Dhanañjaya of the tenth century A D —containing also a section on dramaturgy besides sections on Rasa and allied topics—commented on by Dhanika, a contemporary of Dhanañjaya in his *Avaloka*

*Aucityavicāra and Karikānthābhāṣana* } by Ksemendra of the eleventh century A D —the first, discussing propriety as essential to sentiment and the second, discussing such topics as the possibility of becoming a poet, the issue of borrowing, etc. etc.

*Sarasvatīkanthābhāṣana and Śṛṅgārāpīkāśa* } by Bhoja of the first half of the eleventh century A D —the first, an encyclopaedic work containing information about different schools of poetics and the second, a supplement to the first and containing a section on dramaturgy

*Vyaktiviveka* by Mahimabhatta of the second half of the eleventh century A D who belonged to the reactionary school

to Dhvani—containing discussions on the possibility of including Dhvani under inference

*Manvaprakāśa* by Mammata of the eleventh century AD—highly influenced by the writings of Anantavardhana and Abhinavagupta—discusses Rasa as the soul of poetry—commented on by Pataka (identified with Ruyyaka author of the *Alankarasaracastri*) Mujumkarantra Śrīdhara Candikāśa Vivandita and Govindabesides a number of minor commentators.

*Bhāratpradīpikā* by Śrīmadatanaya who flourished in the first half of the twelfth century AD and was one of the later writers on Rasa—highly influenced by the works of Bhoja—dealing with topics of drama

*Alankarasaracastri* by Ruyyaka of the latter half of the twelfth century AD—written in the line of Udbhaṭa—discussing the importance of Dhvani in so far as it embellishes the expressed meaning—commented on by Jayaratha Vidyāteakrivarman and others

*Kaṭyanasūtana* by Hemacandra belonging to the twelfth century AD who has borrowed from the writings of Abhinavagupta Mammata Kuntala and others

*Vāgbhatāṅkūṭa* by Vāgbhata of the twelfth century A D —a work in verses

*Candīlōka* by Jayadeva who was not earlier than the twelfth century A D a convenient manual of figures of speech with happy illustrations

*Rasamañjarī* & *Rasatananginī* } by Bhānudatta who was not earlier than the twelfth century A D the two works treating of Rasa and allied topics

*Nāṭyadarpana* by Rāmacandīa and Gunacandīa of the twelfth century A D —a work on dramaturgy differing widely from the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata

*Kāvyañuśāsana* by Vāgbhata of the thirteenth century A D who has followed Hemacandīa

*Kavītūaḥasya* or *Kāvyaśāstratā* } by Anasimha and his pupil Amara-candīa, two Śvetāmbara Jainas, belonging to the thirteenth century A D

*Kavikalpatā* by Deveśvara, a Jaina writer, probably belonging to the thirteenth century A D

*Nāṭakalakṣanaratnakośa* by Sāgaranandin of the thirteenth century A D —a work on dramaturgy—strictly following the *Nāṭyaśāstra*

*Ekāvalī* by Vidyādharīa of the fourteenth century A D —written for King Narasimha of Orissa—belonging to the Dhvani school commented on by Mallinātha in his *Taralū*



*Prataparudraya obhā ana* by Vidyānītha of the fourteenth century A D—written for king Pratāparudra of Warangal—a voluminous treatise containing various informations about poetics and dramaturgy

*Sāhityadarpana* by Viśvanītha of the fourteenth century A D—treating in the manner of Maṇḍana Prakāśa as the soul of poetry though fully acknowledging the importance of Dhvani—containing discussions on both poetics and dramaturgy—criticizing Maṇḍana and in turn criticized by Govinda and Jagannītha

*Ujjvalamāmani* by Rūpagosvīmin of the sixteenth century A D who regards the Erotic as only a different name of the Devotional (*Bhakti*)—commented on by Jivagosvīmin who flourished after him in the same century, in his *Locanarocana*

*Alankarasekhara* by Acārya of the sixteenth century A D—a short treatise on poetics the Kīrtikīs of which according to the author are the composition of Śaundhodaya

*Citramimāṃsā and Kuralayānanda* } by Appayyadikṣita of the seventeenth century A D who is noted for his critical insight and originality of appreciation the first has been criticized by Jagannītha and the second is based on the *Candrālola* of Jayadeva

*Rasagangūdhara* by Jagannātha of the seventeenth century A D who is the last of the Titans in Indian poetics and evinces a superb power of criticism and presentation an important work on the dialectics of Indian poetics in particular

### REFERENCES

- De, S K Sanskrit Poetics, Vols I & II  
Kane, P V Sāhityadaipana (Introduction)  
Keith, A B A History of Sanskrit Literature

## CHAPTER TWELVE

### METRICS

#### A

#### INTRODUCTION

In the Brāhmanas we find discussions on metrical matters and it may be presumed that at that time the study of metrics was deemed essential as one of six Vedāṅgas

*Metrics  
a Vedāṅga*

Pingala is however, the earliest known author on prosody. In his work which is of the Sūtra type we find for the first time the use of algebraic symbols. The book discusses both Vedic and Classical metres. Scholars opine that Pingala's work is surely earlier than the chapters on metre (chs XIV, XV) in the *Natyasastra* and the metrical section of the *Agnipurana*. The text attributed to this author on Prākṛit metres (*Prakṛita Paṅgala*) is undoubtedly a later work.

*Pingala  
his Sūtra*

#### B

#### WORKS ON METRICS

*Śrutabodha* ascribed to Kīlīdīśa and often attributed to Vararuci—a manual of Classical metres

- Suṃtātīlaka* by Ksemendia of the eleventh century A D —containing a variety of Classical metres
- Chando'nusāsana* by Hemacandīa of the twelfth century A D—a compilation and not an original work
- Vṛttaratnākara* by Kedārabhatta (earlier than the fifteenth century A D)—a bulky book dealing with *one hundred and thirty-six* metres
- Vṛttaratnākara* by Nārāyana of the sixteenth century A D
- Chandomaṇḍarī* by Gangādāsa—a late and yet popular work on prosody

## REFERENCES

- Keith, A B A History of Sanskrit Literature  
 Macdonell, A A A History of Sanskrit Literature  
 Weber, A The History of Indian Literature

## CHAPTER THIRTEEN

### LEXICOGRAPHY

#### A

#### INTRODUCTION

Yaska's *Nirukta* is the oldest extant lexicographic work which contains a collection of Vedic terms. The lexicons of Classical Sanskrit literature are in many respects different from the *Nirukta*. One of the salient points of difference is that the Classical dictionaries treat of nouns and indeclinables while the *Nighantus* contain both nominal and verbal forms. Almost all the lexicographical works of Classical Sanskrit are written in verse.

Yaska  
*Nirukta*.

The *Namalinganusasana* or the *Amarakosa* is one of the earliest lexicographical works in Classical Sanskrit. Amarasimha, the author, probably flourished in the seventh century A.D. He is however believed to have been one of the nine gems in the court of the famous Vikramaditya. Of the many commentators of this work, Kshirabhanu, Sarvananda, Bhanuji and Mithesvar are well known.

Amara  
simha  
*Amarakosa*

## B

## LESS IMPORTANT LEXICONS

*Trikūṇḍalaśeṣa* & *Hārūvalī* } by Puruṣottama—both early lexicons, containing a collection of many rare words

*Anekūṇṭhasamuccaya* by Śāśvata a contemporary of Amarasimha

*Abhidhanaratnamālā* by Halāyudha of the tenth century A D

*Varjayanī* by Yādava of the eleventh century A D

*Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* & *Anekūṇṭhasaṃgraha* } by Hemacandra of the twelfth century A D—both containing a rich variety of words

*Viśvaparakūṣa* by Meheśvara of the twelfth century A D

*Anekūṇṭhaśabdakośa* by Medinikāra of the fourteenth century A D

*Vācaspatya* by Tānātha Taikavācaspati of the nineteenth century A D—an encyclopaedic work of outstanding merit

*Śabdakalpadrūpa* an encyclopaedic compilation made by a batch of Sanskrit Pandits in the nineteenth century A D, under the patronage of Rājā Śrī Rādhakānta Deva

## REFERENCES

- Keith, A B A History of Sanskrit Literature  
 Macdonell, A A A History of Sanskrit Literature  
 Weber, A The History of Indian Literature

## CHAPTER FOURTEEN

### CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LAW

A

#### GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF LEGAL WORKS

Besides the *Śroutasūtras* and the *Grhya* *sūtras* there were in ancient times a number of *Dharmasūtras* which may be viewed as rudimentary texts on civil and religious law. Among these *Dharmasūtras* mention must be made of the *Dharmasūtras* of Gautama, Harita, Vasistha, Bodhāyana, Āpastamba, Huanyakesin and others. It is not definitely known when these *Sūtras* were composed but it is generally believed that their age would approximately be the fifth or the fourth century B.C. Two other *Dharmasūtras*, the *Varṇasādharmasūtra* and the *Varṇhasādharmasūtra* were written at a later period, the former being assigned to the third century A.D.

Early  
Dharma  
sūtras

The most outstanding and popular work on Brahmanical laws is the *Manusmṛiti* or the *Manuśāstra*. Though the author of this work is generally known to be

rti  
bip

Manu, still the present text is said to have been the work of Bhṛgu. Again, from certain references it becomes evident that the present version of the *Manusmṛti* was narrated by one student of Bhṛgu and not by Bhṛgu himself even. Dr. Bühler suggests that the *Mānavadharmasāstra* or the *Manusmṛti* is a recast and versification of one original work of the type of Sūtra works known as the *Mānavasūtrākaraṇa*, a subdivision of the Maitrāyaṇīya school which adheres to a redaction of the *Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda*.

It has been argued that the present text of the *Manusmṛti* contains various facts about the supremacy of the Brāhmanas over other castes. The presumption, therefore, is that the work was written at a time when the Brāhmanas were kings of India and had great power in their hands. History tells us that there were Brāhmana kings in India after the fall of the Śūngas. It is known that the Kānvas ruled in ancient India for forty-five years in the first century B.C. It is suggested that the present text of the *Manusmṛti* was prepared during the reign of the Kānvas.

The *Manusmṛti* is written in lucid



Sanskrit verse which comprises 2684 couplets arranged in *twelve* chapters. The work has been commented on by numerous scholars including Medhātithi, Govindaraja, Nārāyaṇa, Kullūla, Raghavānanda and Nānāda.

Contents &  
commen-  
tators

## B

## IMPORTANT WORKS ON LAW

*Nārada-smṛti* Presumably a late work which has its individual merits but cannot stand comparison with the work of Manu—usually regarded as the legal supplement to the *Manu-smṛti*.

*Bṛhaspati-smṛti* A supplementary work to the *Manu-smṛti*—belonging to the sixth or the seventh century A D.

*Yājñavalkyasmṛti* An important work in the style of the *Manu-smṛti*—containing a methodical and highly satisfactory treatment with stamps of individuality—not earlier than the third century A D—commented on by Viṣṇuśeṣara of the eleventh century A D in his *Mitākṣarā*.

*Tatātītamatatīlaka*  
*Saṃskara-paddhati*  
& *Prayascittaparakaraṇa* } by Bhavadevabhattacharya (eleventh century A D) the famous minister of King Harivarman of south Bengal

*Smṛtikalpataṛu* by Lakṣmidhara minister of Govindacandra of Kanauj (twelfth century A D)

- Parūśanasmṛiti*      The author of this work is not the same person quoted as an authority by Yājñavalkya—commented on by Mādhava, of the fourteenth century A D, in his *Parūśanamūdhava*
- Bṛāhmanasārvasva*      by Halāyudha, of the twelfth century A D written for King Lakṣmanasena of Bengal
- Daśakarmapaddhati*      by Paśupati of the twelfth century A D
- Pratīdayatā*      by Annuddha of the twelfth century A D
- Caturvarṅacintāmaṇi*      by Hemādī of the thirteenth century A D a voluminous work
- Dharmaratna*      by Jīmūtavāhana of the fourteenth century A D—an important work containing the famous *Dūyabhāgū* which dominates the views of Bengal on inheritance
- Dīpakalikā*      by Śūlapāni of the fourteenth century A D—a commentary on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛiti*
- Madanapūrijūta*      by Viśveśvara of the fourteenth century A D—a work on religious laws
- Vivādātātūkāra*,  
*Smṛitātūkāra*  
and other  
*Rātūkāras*      } by Candēśvara, grand-uncle of, Vidyāpati, minister of Haṁsiṃha of the fourteenth century A D—very important law books
- Rāghunandanasmṛitis*      by Rāghunandana of the sixteenth century A D—*twenty-eight* in number—all bearing the appella-

tion of *Tattva* or *Tithatattva*  
*Uttahatattva* etc.—highly autho-  
 ritative specially in Bengal

<i>Viśadacintāmanī</i>	}	by Viśaspati who wrote for Bhairavasimha (Harinirī- yana) and Ramabhadra (Rupanirīyana) of Mithila (fifteenth century A D)— highly important law books
<i>Vyavaharacintāmanī</i>		
and other		
<i>Cintāmanīs</i>		

*Vīramitrodaya* by Vīramīra of the seventeenth  
 century A D—a voluminous work

*Nirnayasindhu* by Kamalākaraśāstra of the seven-  
 teenth century A D

#### REFERENCES

Buhler G SBI Vol XXV

Kane P V History of Dharmasāstra

Keith A B A History of Sanskrit Literature

Weber A The History of Indian Literature

## CHAPTER FIFTEEN

### POLITICS

#### A

### INTRODUCTION

Of the four objects of life the science of politics deals with the aim and achievement of the second (*artha*) and Kautilya's *Arthaśāstra* amply proves the existence of the study of political science and practical life in ancient India. The *Arthaśāstra* is an outstanding work in the field of Indian politics and is claimed by some modern scholars to have been composed sometime in the third century A D, though traditionally the author is believed to have been none other than Cānakya or Viṣnugupta, the able minister of Maurya Candragupta (fourth century B C), who has been unanimously recognized by all scholars as the Machiavelli of India. The *Arthaśāstra*, however, mentions *Brhaspati*, *Bāhudantīputra*, *Viśālākṣa* and *Uśanas* as authorities. The book is a perfect manual for the conduct of kings in their political existence. Later works on this science are mainly based on the *Arthaśāstra*.

## B

## MINOR WORKS ON POLITICS

- Nītisāra* by Kīmandaka—written in verse with the character of a Kīvya—not later than the eighth century A D
- Nītnākyamṛta* by Somadeva the author of Yaśas tilaka—the details of war and kindred topics are meagely dealt with and the author appears to be a great moral teacher
- Laṅghu Arhamṇṭi* by the great Jaina writer Hemacandra (1088 A D—1172 A D)—written in verse—an abbreviation of another bigger work of the author written in Prākṛit
- Yuktīkalpataru* ascribed to Bhoja
- Nītiratnākara* by Candēvara a jurist—grand uncle of Vidyāpati
- Sukraṇṭi* of unknown authorship—a work of a very late date mentioning the use of gunpowder

## REFERENCES

- Keith A B A History of Sanskrit Literature
- Macdonell A A A History of Sanskrit Literature
- Weber A The History of Indian Literature

## CHAPTER SIXTEEN

### EROTICS

#### A

#### INTRODUCTION

Vātsyāyana:  
Kāmasūtra

Erotics or the science of love was specially studied in ancient India. The most outstanding work on the subject is the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana who is placed sometime in the third century A.D. The work is divided into seven parts and is written in prose interspersed with stray verses. The work does not claim to have been the first to be written on that subject. The work is a mine of informations on matters relating to the social order and customs of the day.

Yaśodhara  
Jaya-  
mangalā

Yaśodhara of the thirteenth century A.D. wrote a commentary, the *Jayamangalā*, on the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana. Credit is due to this commentator who has explained many technical terms used by Vātsyāyana.

#### B

#### MINOR WORKS ON EROTICS

*Pañcasūyaka* by Jyotirīśvara—later than Ksemendra  
*Ratnahasya* by Kokkoka—prior to 1200 A.D.

- Ratīmañjarī* by one Jayadeva of unknown date—  
sometimes identified with the  
, poet of the *Gitagovinda*
- Anangaranga* by Kalyānamalla of the sixteenth  
century A D
- Ratīsāstra* by Nīgārjuna of unknown date—often  
wrongly identified with the great  
Buddhist thinker

## REFERENCE

- Keith A B    *A History of Sanskrit Literature*

# CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

## MEDICINE

### A

#### HISTORY OF MEDICAL WORKS

Introduc-  
tion

A study of Vedic literature will reveal that Anatomy, Embryology and Hygiene were known to Vedic Indians. The science of Āyurveda was also looked upon as one of the auxiliary sciences to the Vedas. There are references in early literature to ancient sages who delivered instruction on the science of medicine. Ātreya is one of these sages who is usually held to be the founder of the science while Cāṇakya is said to have written on medicine. According to Buddhist tradition, Jīvaka, a student of Ātreya, was a specialist in the diseases of children.

Caraka

The earliest extant literature on medicine is the *Carakasamhitā*. Caraka, according to Professor Lévi, was a contemporary of King Kaniska. It is, however, known that the present text of Caraka was revised by one Drḍhabala, a Kāshmirian, who lived as late as the eighth or the ninth century A.D.

Suśruta is another great teacher of Indian medicine whose name occurs in the famous



Bower Manuscript and who is mentioned as the son of Visvamintra in the *Mahabharata*. As early as the ninth and the tenth centuries his reputation travelled far beyond India. Among his commentators mention must be made of Cakrapāṇidatta (eleventh century A D), besides Jaiyyata Gayadāsa and Dallana.

Susruta &  
his com-  
mentators

Bhela is another authority who is said to have written a *Samhita* which, in the opinion of some scholars is earlier than the work of Cūṛka.

Bhela

## B

### LATER MEDICAL WORKS

<i>Aṣṭaṅgasamgraha</i> and <i>Aṣṭāṅgaḥṛdayasamhitā</i>	}	by Vāgbhata the next great authority after Susruta—often identified with the medical authority referred to by I tsing
---	---	---

*Rasaratnākara* by Nāgārjuna probably of the seventh or the eighth century A D —containing a section on the practical application of mercury

*Vidana* by Mīdhavakara of the eighth or the ninth century A D—an important treatise on Pathology

*Cikitsasarasamgraha* by Cakrapāṇidatta a work on Therapeutics

## 186 AN INTRODUCTION TO CLASSICAL SANSKRIT

*Chitsūkalikā* by Tisata of the fourteenth century  
A D

*Bhāvapakāśa* by Bhāvamiśra of the sixteenth  
century A D

*Vaidyānāna* by Lohmbanāja of the seventeenth  
century A D

### REFERENCES

- Keith, A B A History of Sanskrit Literature  
Macdonell, A A A History of Sanskrit Literature.  
Weber, A The History of Indian Literature

## CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

### ASTRONOMY, MATHEMATICS AND ASTROLOGY

#### A

#### HISTORY OF ASTRONOMY

It is not definitely known whether Astronomy was systematically studied as a science in Vedic times. It is as late as the sixth century AD when in the *Pañca siddhantika* of Varāhamihira we get the information about the contents of five Siddhantas of an earlier date. It is, however a fact that the lunar mansions were known to Vedic Indians. Dr. Weber says that the names of some asterisms occur in the *Rgveda*, the *Satapathabrahmana*, the *Taittiriyaśamhitā* and the *Atharvaveda*. It is presumed that with the discovery of planets the science of Astronomy made a significant advance. Planets are mentioned in the *Taittiriyaśamhitā* the two Great Epics, and the Law books of Manu. It still remains an open question however whether the ancient Indians discovered the planets independently of others or whether

**Astronomy  
an early  
science**

the knowledge came to them from a foreign source. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that Indian Astronomy thrived well under Greek influence.

## B

## WORKS ON ASTRONOMY

Āryabhata  
his works

Before the discovery of the *Pañca-siddhāntikā*, Āryabhata was regarded as the only authority on Indian Astronomy. Āryabhata wrote towards the close of the fifth century A.D. Three of his works now available to us are the *Āryabhaṭīya*, in ten stanzas, the *Daśagītiśāsūtra* and the *Āryā-śaśata* in which there is a section on Mathematics.

Āryabhata  
Ārya-  
siddhānta

Āryabhata is to be carefully distinguished from another author of the same name who wrote the *Āryasiddhānta* in the tenth century A.D. and was known to Albēriūnī.

Brahma-  
gupta his  
works

Brahmagupta is another great name in Indian Astronomy who in the seventh century A.D. wrote two important works, the *Brahmasphuṭasiddhānta* and the *Khandakhadyaka*.

Lalla who is later than Brahmagupta, has to his credit one work the *Ṣiṣyadhīṣṭ* *ddhitānta*

Lalla  
Ṣiṣyadhīṣṭ  
ddhitānta

To the eleventh century belong two writers Bhoja and Śaṭānanda whose works are respectively the *Rajamrṅga* and the *Bhāṣatī*

Bhoja &  
Śaṭānanda  
their works

Bhāskaraīya of 1150 AD wrote his masterpiece the *Siddhantaśiroma* which is divided into four sections A second work of his is the *Āraṇa* *utuhala*

Bhāskara  
his works

## C

### WORKS ON MATHEMATICS

In the field of Indian Mathematics there are only a few names Āryabhaṭa was the first to include in his work a section on Mathematics Brahmagupta has discussed the principles of ordinary Arithmetic in a brief manner In the ninth century AD Mahāvīraīya wrote an elementary but comprehensive work on Indian Mathematics In the tenth century AD he wrote his *Trisatī* which discusses quadratic equations It was Bhāskaraīya who in the two sections viz, *Līlāvatī* and *Bījaganita* of his work the *Siddhantaśiroma* made

Āryabhaṭa  
Brahma  
gupta  
Mahāvīra &  
Bhāskara

some lasting contributions to Indian Mathematics

## D

### WORKS ON ASTROLOGY

Early  
works

In India Astrology has been studied as a science from very ancient times. The works of Varāhamihna, of course, eclipsed the fame of earlier authorities whose writings are now lost to us. Fragments of one *Vṛddhagaṅga-saṃhitā* are still available. Varāhamihna classified Astrology into the *three* branches of *Tantra* the astronomical and mathematical foundations, *Horā* that dealing with horoscope and *Saṃhitā* that discussing natural Astrology. The most outstanding contribution of Varāhamihna is the *Brhat-saṃhitā* which was commented on by Bhattotpala. On the *Horā* section Varāhamihna wrote two works, the *Bṛhajjātaka* and the *Laghujātaka*. Besides the works of Varāhamihna, we find a reference to one *Yavana-jātaka* of dubious authorship.

Later works

Among later works on Astrology, mention may be made of the *Horāśatapañcāśikā* by Prthuyāśas, son of Varāhamihna, the *Horāśāstra* by Bhattotpala, the *Vidyā-*



## CHAPTER NINETEEN

### MISCELLANEOUS SCIENCES

#### Archery

It is a pity that though the Indians specialized in almost every branch of Sanskrit literature, the literature on quite a good number of minor sciences is little known to us. Thus there are no extant works on Archery. Among the authoritative writers on Archery the names of Vikramāditya, Sadāśiva and Śārangadatta have reached us.

#### Sciences of elephants & horses

On the sciences of elephants and horses which are associated with the names of two ancient sages Pālakāpya and Śālihotia respectively, a few works are available. The *Hastyāyurveda* of uncertain date and the *Mātangalīlā* of Nārāyana are the two known works on the science of elephants. The *Aśvāyurveda* of Gana, the *Aśiavardya* of Jayadatta and of Dīpankara, the *Yogamañjarī* of Vaidhānāna and the *Aśiacikitsā* of Nakula are extant works on the science of horses.

#### Architecture

The literature on Architecture is represented by the *Vāstuvidyā*, the *Manuśyālayacandrikā* in seven chapters, the *Mayamāta*



in *thirty four* chapters, the *Yuktikalpataru* in *twenty three* chapters, the *Samarangana sutradhara* of Bhoja, the *Viśālarma prākāśa* and some sections of the *Brhatsam hita*, the *Matsyapurāna*, the *Agnipurāna* the *Garudapurāna*, the *Viśnudharmottara*, the *Kāsyapasamhitā*, the *Silparatna* of Śrīkumāra and such other works

The science of jewels has been discussed in such works as the *Agastimata*, the *Ratnaparikṣa* of Buddhabhaṭṭa and the *Navaratnaparikṣa* of Narāyaṇapandita

Science of  
Jewels

Mention may be made of the *Sam mukha lalpa*, a treatise on the science of stealing

Science of  
Stealing

Mention should also be made of the *Nalapakā* which treats of the art of cooking

Science of  
Cooking

On music there have been many important works besides the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Among the more important works on this subject, mention may be made of the *Sāṅgitamahāśāstra*, the *Sāṅgitasudāśāna* of Sudāśana, the *Sāṅgitaratnākara* of Saṅgideva, the *Sāṅgitadarpaṇa* of Dāmodara and the *Rāgaribodha* of Somanātha

Science of  
Music

On dancing the literature is not very extensive. Besides the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, we have the *Abhinayadarpaṇa* of Nandikesvara,

Science of  
Dancing

the *Śīhastamuktāvalī*, the *Nartananṇaya* and a few other works

Science of  
Painting

On painting the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, of uncertain date, contains a chapter

#### REFERENCES

- Keith, A. B.    A History of Sanskrit Literature  
Weber, A.      The History of Indian Literature

## CHAPTER TWENTY

### PHILOSOPHY

#### A

#### ORTHODOX SYSTEMS

The Nyāya system which represents the analytic type of philosophy like the Vaiśeṣika system has a long history that extends over the vast period of twenty centuries. Indian tradition has assigned a unique status to this system and it has been universally held in high esteem and reverence.

I  
Nyāya

Introduc-  
tion

There are two well known schools of the Nyāya system and they are the old and the new. The earliest known literature of the old school are the *Nyāyasūtras* of Gautama which are divided into five books. It is believed that the *Nyāyasūtras* are as old as the third century B.C.<sup>1</sup> Vātsyāyana's

Works on  
Nyāya  
(a) Old  
school

<sup>1</sup> Dr. S. C. Vidyabhusana believes that Gautama wrote only the first chapter of the work and was a contemporary of Buddha. He further thinks that this Gautama is the same as the author of the *Dharmaśāstras* who lived in Mithilā in the sixth century B.C. He suggests that Gautama's original views are contained in the *Carakasamhitā* (*Vimanasthana*). But the *Carakasamhitā* itself has suffered considerable loss.

*Nyāyabhāṣya* is the most important commentary on the *Nyāyasūtras* of Gautama and it is presumed that the work was written before 400 A D Vātsyāyana's views were vehemently criticized by Dignāga, the famous Buddhist logician, whose probable date is not later than the fifth century A D Uddyotakara wrote his *Nyāyavārttika* in the sixth century A D. with the sole object of defending Vātsyāyana against the criticisms of Dignāga It was Dharmakīrti, another noted Buddhist logician, who took up the cause of Dignāga and wrote his *Nyāyabindu* in the latter part of the sixth century A D Probably Uddyotakara and Dharmakīrti were contemporaries

fashioning and its date is uncertain Professor Jacobi believes that the *Nyāyasūtras* and the *Nyāyabhāṣya* belong to about the same time perhaps separated by a generation He places them between the second century A D when the doctrine of Śūnya developed, and the fifth century A D when the doctrine of Viññāna was systematized Professor Suali also supports Professor Jacobi and refers the work to 300 A D According to Professor Garbe the date is 100 A D MM Haraprasāda Śāstrin believes that the work has undergone several redactions Professor Radhakrishnan places it (though not in the present form) in the fourth century B C

who mutually referred to each other. A commentary on the *Nyayabindu* was written in the ninth century by the Buddhist logician Dharmottara. It was in the first half of the ninth century A.D. that Vācaspati, a versatile genius and most prolific writer, came to write his *Nyayavarttikatatpariyāṭika*, a super commentary on the *Nyayavarttika* of Uddyotakara and gave a sufficient stimulus to the orthodox line of thought by writing his *Nyayasūcibandha* (841 A.D.) and *Nyayasūtrōddhara*. Udayana who is noted for his trenchant logic and convincing presentation of facts, wrote a commentary on Vācaspati's *Nyayavarttikatatpariyāṭika*, known as the *Nyayavarttikatatpariyāṭikāśuddhi* in the last part of the tenth century (984 A.D.). The *Nyayakusumāñjali*, the *Ātmatattvaviveka*, the *Kṛāntikālī* and the *Nyayaparīkṣā* are four other well known works of Udayana. Jayanta is the next great name after Udayana and he wrote the *Nyayamañjarī* in the tenth century A.D. He is admitted to have been a Bengali by origin. Bhāsarvajña's *Nyayasāra* is a survey of Indian logic. The author was a Kashmiri Śaivite of the tenth century A.D.

Gangesa is the father of the new school

Works on  
Nyāya  
(b) New  
school

of the Nyāya system (Navyanyāya) which flourished mainly in Bengal. His *Tattvacintāmanī* is a *magnum opus* which was written in the last quarter of the twelfth century A.D. The work discusses primarily the *four* means of knowledge admitted in the Nyāya system. His son Vaidhāmāna (1225 A.D.) continued the tradition by writing commentaries on the treatises of Udayana and Gangeśa. Jayadeva (sometimes identified with Paksadhara Miśra) of Mithilā wrote his *Āloka* on the *Tattvacintāmanī* in the latter part of the thirteenth century A.D. Vāsudeva Śaivabhauma, a Bengali Brāhmaṇa, wrote his *Tattvacintāmanivyākhyā* the first great work of the Navadvīpa (Nadia) school. He had at least three distinguished pupils Śrī-Caitanya Mahāprabhu, the famous Vaiṣṇava saint and founder of the Gaudīya Vaiṣṇava school, Raghunātha Śrīnomaṇi, the great logician and Kṛṣṇānanda Āgama-vāgiśa, the author of the *Tantrasāra*. Raghunātha wrote two outstanding works, viz, the *Dīdhiti* and the *Padārthakhandana* in the fifteenth century A.D. Jagadīśa (end of the sixteenth century A.D.) and Gadādhara (seventeenth century A.D.) are reputed

thinkers of the modern school, who wrote beside many commentaries, the *Śabdasañcīpanī* and the *Vyaptipañcālā* respectively. Viśva mātṛ's *Nyāyasūtravṛtti* (1631 A.D.) is another important work.

The logicians of the old school recognize sixteen categories while those of the modern school who have been greatly influenced by the Vaiśeṣika system reduce them to seven only. The logicians of both schools accept four means of proof viz. perception (*pratyakṣa*) inference (*anumāna*) analogy (*upamāna*) and verbal testimony (*śabda*). They do not admit of the self-manifestation of a cognition. Like the Vaiśeṣika the Nyāya regards the world as a composite of external unchangeable and causeless atoms. The soul in the Nyāya system is a 'real substantive being' which has certain qualities. The God (*īśvara*) is the Supreme Spirit or the Universal Soul who acts as the Creator of the universe in the capacity of an efficient cause (*nimittakāraṇa*) while the atoms are the material cause (*upādānakāraṇa*). A true knowledge (*tattvajñāna*) of the categories leads to the liberation (*mukti*) of the soul in bondage and the liberated soul is essentially conscious.

Funda-  
mental  
concepts  
of Nyāya

## II Vaiśeṣika

### Introduction

The Vaiśeṣika system which is also called the Aulūkyā philosophy, is closely akin to the Nyāya system. It is, however, presumed that the earliest extant literature of this system is older than what is available in the Nyāya system. Thus while the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* of Kanāda (Kanabhakṣa, Kanabhuk or Kāśvapa) and the *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha* of Praśastapāda, evince no influence of the Nyāya system, the *Nyāyasūtras* of Gautama and the *Bhāṣya* of Vātsyāyana betray the fact that they have been greatly influenced by the views of the Vaiśeṣika system.

### Works on Vaiśeṣika

The *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* of Kanāda which are of unknown date but are generally assigned to a date which is later than 300 B C, received additions from time to time. They are divided into *ten* books. The work of Praśastapāda which is generally regarded as a commentary on the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* may be viewed as an original contribution to the Vaiśeṣika system. Praśastapāda is usually assigned to the end of the fourth century A D., though Dr. Keith makes him later than Dignāga, but earlier than Uddyotakara. There are *four* noted commentaries on the work of Praśastapāda and they are



(1) the *Vyomaratī* by Vyomasīcārya is Vyomāśekhara or Sivāditya (of unknown date, probably of the ninth century A.D.) (2) the *Nyayaśāstra* by Sudhara (last part of the tenth century A.D.), (3) the *Kīrtanārati* and the *Lalānārati* by Udayāra (last part of the tenth century A.D.) and (4) the *Nyayaśāstra* by Srivatsa or Vallabha (probably towards the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century A.D.) Śaṅkara's *Upaśāstra* (latter half of the fifteenth century A.D.) is one important commentary on the *Vaiśeṣikaśāstras* of Kāṇāda. Laṅkāśi Bhāskara's *Tārāśāstra* is another work based on Prāśastapāda's treatise.

Among manuals belonging to both Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika systems of Indian philosophy, may be mentioned Sivāditya's *Saptapadārthī* (eleventh century A.D.) Vāṇanātha's *Tārāśāstra* Kesava Misra's *Tārāśāstra* (thirteenth or fourteenth century A.D.) Anandabhatta's *Tārāśāstra* and *Dīpa* (sixteenth or seventeenth century A.D.), Jagadisa's *Tārāśāstra* (1635 A.D.) and Viśvanātha's *Bhāṣyaśāstra* or *Kārikāśāstra* (seventeenth century A.D.) and its famous commentary *Siddhāntamuktārati* by him.

Manuals of  
Nyāya &  
Vaiśeṣika

self Jayanāīyana's (seventeenth century A D) *Vivṛti* is another important compendium of the Vaiśeṣika school

Funda-  
mental  
concepts of  
Vaisesika

The Vaiśeṣika system which in broader details agrees with the Nyāya, accepts *six* categories to which a *seventh* was added later on It recognizes only *two* means of knowledge, viz, perception and inference It does not accept verbal testimony as an independent means of proof, but as one included in inference Both the Vaiśeṣika and the Naiyāyika are advocates of what is known in philosophical terms as Asatkāyavāda (the doctrine of the creation of the non-existent effect) and Ātambhavāda (the doctrine of initiation which makes the universe an effect newly produced from the eternal atoms) In the state of liberation, the soul in Vaiśeṣika conception retains no consciousness (*jñāna*), while in the Nyāya view the released soul is conscious

III  
Sāṅkhya

Introduc-  
tion

The Sāṅkhya system is universally believed to be the oldest of the existing systems of Indian philosophy The Sāṅkhya views are found in the Upanisads, in the *Mahābhārata*, in the Law-books of Manu and in the medical works of Caraka and others Indian tradition ascribes the

authorship of the system to the sage Kapila in incarnation of Lord Viṣṇu. The successors of Kapila were Āsuri, Pāñcāsikha, Gaṅgā and Ulūka. Professor Grube makes Pāñcāsikha a contemporary of the great Mimāṃsist Śaṅkarasūram (sometime between 100 A.D. and 300 A.D.). Chinese tradition ascribes the authorship of the *Saṅkhyatāntira* to Pāñcāsikha while Vīrasagunya gets the same credit in other opinion.

The *Saṅkhyānirṇaya* is the earliest known work of the Sāṅkhya system. It is believed that Īśvarakṛṣṇa wrote this work in the third century A.D.<sup>1</sup> An important commentary on the *Ānirṇaya* is that of Gaṇḍarvāda.<sup>2</sup> The *Mātharavṛtti* is another commentary which is regarded by some to be the source of Gaṇḍarvāda's commentary while others

Works on  
Sāṅkhya

<sup>1</sup> A Chinese tradition ascribes to Vindhyaśālin the writing of a work of Vīrasagunya. Professor Tikhonov identifies Vindhyaśālin with Īśvarakṛṣṇa. In this case the *Ānirṇaya* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa has an earlier basis. Gunaratna however regards Vindhyaśālin and Īśvarakṛṣṇa as different. Īśvarakṛṣṇa was earlier than Vasubandhu who is now assigned to the fourth century A.D. The *Karikā* was translated into Chinese by Paramārtha (sixth century A.D.).

<sup>2</sup> Whether he is the same as the author of the

assign a later date to it. Yet another commentary on the *Sāṅkhyakārikā* is the *Yuktīdīpikā* which is wrongly ascribed to Vācaspati. The *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* of Vācaspati (middle of the ninth century A D) is a most popular work of this system. Another popular work is the *Sāṅkhyaprapāñśa* which contains six chapters. The authorship of this work is attributed to one Kapila. But this Kapila cannot be identical with the founder sage of this system, for the work cannot but be assigned to such a late date as the fourteenth century A D, since it is not referred to even in the *Sarva-darśanasamgraha* of Mādhava (fourteenth century A D). Anandha's *Sāṅkhyasūtravṛtti* which was composed in the fifteenth century A D, is an important work commenting on the *Sāṅkhyaprapāñśa*. But the *Sāṅkhyaprapāñśabhāṣya* of Viṇṇāna-bhikṣu, (sixteenth century A D) a commentary on the *Sāṅkhyaprapāñśa*, is the most important work of the system. Viṇṇāna-bhikṣu wrote another work on Sāṅkhya known as the *Sāṅkhyasāra*.

*Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* cannot be decided, and some seek to place him in the eighth century A D.

The Sāṅkhya system is essentially dualistic, inasmuch as it speaks of *Puruṣa* (Spirit) and *Prakṛti* (Matter) as the two Ultimate Realities. The fundamental position of this system is that 'cause is the entity in which 'effect' lies in a subtle form. Thus this system advocates the doctrine of *Sāṅkhyavāda*. The world is said to be the evolution of *Prakṛti* which is its material cause. *Prakṛti* has been described to be of the nature of equilibrium of the triple *Guṇas* *sattva* (purity stuff) *rajas* (passion stuff) and *tamas* (inertia stuff). *Puruṣa* is defined as Pure Spirit which is different from *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣas* are many in number. A Supreme Spirit (*Īśvara*) or God is not admitted to exist in so many words. The Sāṅkhya system acknowledges the authority of *three* means of knowledge viz perception inference and verbal testimony.

Fundamental concepts of Sāṅkhya

The *Yoga* and the Sāṅkhya systems are used as complementary aspects of one whole system. While the Sāṅkhya system signifies theory, the *Yoga* signifies 'practice'. In the *Upaniṣads*, the *Mahābhārata*, the *Jāmba* and the Buddhist literatures *Yoga* practices have been mentioned.

IV  
Yoga

Introduction

The *Yogasūtras* of Patañjali form the

earliest extant literature on the Yoga system. The *Yogasūtras* are divided into four chapters known as *Samādhi* (Concentration), *Sādhana* (Practice), *Vibhūti* (Innumerable Powers) and *Kaivalya* (Emancipation). It was Vyāsa who, according to modern scholars, is said to have written a masterly commentary on the *Yogasūtras* about the fourth century A D, though traditionally he is believed to be the same as the author of the *Mahābhārata*. Vācaspati wrote an interesting and learned gloss on the *Vyāsabhāṣya* known as the *Tattvarasāvalī*. Nāgeśabhatta of the eighteenth century A D, wrote another gloss on the *Vyāsabhāṣya* known as the *Chāyā*. Other important works on the Yoga system are the *Rājamārtanda* of Bhoja (eleventh century A D) and the *Yogavārttika* and the *Yogasāraṣaṁgraha* of Viṇṇābhikṣu (sixteenth century A D). Viṇṇābhikṣu criticizes Vācaspati and

<sup>1</sup> It is traditionally believed that Patañjali, the author of the *Yogasūtras* is the same person as the great grammarian of that name who wrote the *Māhābhāṣya* in the middle of the second century B C. But there is no positive evidence to prove the identity and some modern scholars are positively against this

brings the Yoga system nearer to the philosophy of the Upanisads

The Yoga system discusses how through methodical effort of concentration of mind we can attain perfection. It teaches us how to control the different elements of human nature both physical and psychical. The Yoga system explains fully the principles according to which 'the physical body, the active will and the understanding mind are to be harmonically brought under control. This is technically known by the name Royal Yoga (Rājayoga). There is yet a magical side of Yoga (Hathayoga) which describes how to perform miracles of various nature. Too much indulgence in this Hathayoga serves as an obstacle to the attainment of real Perfection.

Rājayoga &  
Hathayoga

The Yoga system materially differs from the Sāṅkhya at least in one essential point viz., that while the latter system does not explicitly speak anything of God the former regards God as a third category besides

Yoga &  
Sāṅkhya  
comparison

view. Bhoja in the introductory verses of the *Rajamūrtiśāstra* makes a suggestion to the effect that Patañjali (author of the *Mahābhāṣya*) Patañjali (author of the *Yogasūtras*) and Caraka (author of the *Carakasamhitā*) are identical.

Prakṛti and Puruṣa and holds that devotion to the Lord is also one of the means of Release (*Kaivalya*).

V  
Pūrvamīmāṃsā

Introduc-  
tion

The Pūrvamīmāṃsā, Karmamīmāṃsā or the Mīmāṃsā system mainly interprets and explains Vedic injunctions and their applications, and as such it has a unique importance of its own.

Works on  
Pūrvamīmāṃsā

The earliest literature on the Pūrvamīmāṃsā are the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras* of Jaimini who, according to modern scholars, wrote in all probability in the fourth century B.C. The orthodox tradition, however, makes Jaimini a disciple of Vyāsa, the author of the *Mahābhārata*. It is held by some that the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* are later than both the *Nyāyasūtras* and the *Yogasūtras*. Śābara wrote his commentary on the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* probably in the first century B.C. Professor Jacobi thinks that the *Vṛtti* quoted by Śābara, belongs to a period between 200 A.D. and 500 A.D., while Dr. Keith holds 400 A.D. to be the earliest date for it. Śābara's predecessors were Upavaśa, Bodhāyana, Bhāṭṛimītra, Bhavadāsa and Harī MM. Sri Ganganath Jha identifies Bhavadāsa with the *Vṛttikāra* referred to in the *Śābarabhāṣya*. Both the *Mīmāṃsā-*



*sūtras* and the *Bhāṣya* were interpreted differently by three different schools of thought associated with the names of Prabhākara, Kumārila and Mīmāṃsā. The school of Mīmāṃsā is known by name alone.

Prabhākara who was called Gaudī munīśvara and Gurū wrote the *Bṛhātī* a commentary on the *Bhāṣya* of Śābārika, probably about 600 A.D. According to some Prabhākara preceded Kumārila, while the tradition runs that he was a pupil of Kumārila. Śālikrānti's *Rjuvimala* which is a commentary on the *Bṛhātī*, was written about the ninth century A.D. Another important work of the same author is the *Praśāntanapañcīla*, a good and useful manual of the Prabhākara system. Śālikrānti has referred to Dharmakīrti. Bhāskara's *Nyaya-vivēka* (c. 1050 A.D.—1150 A.D.) is another important work of this school. Vācaspati in his *Nyayaśāstra* differentiates between two sub-schools of the Prabhākara, viz. old and new.

Kumārila is a great name in Indian philosophy, noted for his spirited zeal for Brahminical orthodoxy. It was he who fought courageously against the onslaughts of Buddhism, and but for the stand he took up, much of Brahminical heritage of which

Prabhākara  
school

Bhāṣya  
school

we feel proud today, would have been lost Kumāṇila's *Ślohavārttika*, *Tantravārttika* and *Tupṭīkā* are the three great works The first one, which is in verse, is a commentary on the first part of the first chapter of the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* The second which is in prose, occasionally interspersed with verses, takes us to the end of the third chapter, while the third covers the rest Kumāṇila is earlier than Śaṅkara and is usually assigned to 750 A D, though some new data point to the fact that he lived in the seventh century A D The *Ślohavārttika* was commented upon by Umbeka or Bhavabhūti (eighth century A D), by Sucaritamiśra (not later than the middle of the thirteenth century A D) in his *Kāśikā* and by Pāṇthasārathimiśra (according to the orthodox tradition, tenth century A D, according to Professor Radhakrishnan, 1300 A D) in his *Nyāyaratnākara* The *Tantravārttika* was commented upon by Bhavadabhata (eleventh century A D) in his *Tantātītamatatīlaka* and by Someśvarabhata (c 1200 A D) in his *Nyāyasūdhā* Veṅkaṭa-dikṣita wrote his commentary on the *Tupṭīkā* known as the *Vārttikābhāṣana* Mandana (eighth century A D) is the next great

name after Kumāṛila who is reported to be Mandana's teacher and father in law Mandana who is earlier than Vācaspati and is traditionally identified with Suresvara and Visvarūpa, wrote his *Vidhiviveka*, *Bhavanuviveka*, *Vibhramaviveka* and *Mīmamsanulīna* <sup>1</sup> The first was commented upon by Vācaspati in his *Nyayahanika*

Among independent works on the Mīmāṃsa system, may be mentioned the *Sastrapīṭha* of Pārthasārathimīśra, the *Jaiminiyanayamala* of Mādhirva (fourteenth century A D), the *Upalāpapaśāṅka* and the *Vidhivāsana* of Appayyaśrī, the *Mīmamsanayapīṭha* of Āpodeva (seventeenth century A D), the *Arthasaṅgraha* of Laṅkāsībhāṣa (seventeenth century A D) the *Bhaṭṭadīpika*, the *Mīmamsalāustubha* and the *Bhaṭṭarāhasya* of Kṛṇḍadeva (seventeenth century A D), the *Bhaṭṭacintāmaṇi* of Gāgabhaṭṭa (seventeenth century A D), the *Manameyodaya* of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa (seventeenth century A D) and the *Mīmamsa paribhaṣa* of Kṛṣṇayajvan (eighteenth century A D) Rāmākṛṣṇabhaṭṭa, author of the *Yukti*

Independent  
works on  
Mīmāṃsā

<sup>1</sup> The *Sphoṭasiddhi* of Mandana which explains the grammarian's doctrine of Sphoṭa is an important work

*snehaprapūṇāṇī*, Somanātha, author of the *Mayūkhāmālikā*, Dinakarabhaṭṭa and Kama-lākarabhaṭṭa belong to the Bhāṭṭa school.

Important  
concepts of  
Mīmāṃsā

The Pūrvamīmāṃsā system recognizes the self-validity of knowledge. Jaimini accepts only *three* means of knowledge - perception, inference and verbal testimony. To these *three* Prabhākara adds *two* more, viz., comparison (*upamāna*) and implication (*arthāpatti*). Kumārila also recognizes non-apprehension (*anupalabdhi*) as a means of knowledge. It is generally believed that the Pūrvamīmāṃsā has not accorded any significant status to God, though, in the *Vedāntasūtras*, Jaimini has been represented as theistic in his views<sup>1</sup>.

VI  
Vedānta

Introduc-  
tion

The Uttaramīmāṃsā, Brahmanmīmāṃsā or the Vedānta is the most popular of all orthodox systems of Indian philosophy. The earliest teachers of the school were Āśmarathya, Bādarī, Kārṣṇājini, Kāśakṛtsna, Audulomi and Ātreyā. These teachers along with Jaimini are mentioned in the *Vedāntasūtras*.

Scholars differ with regard to the age when the *Vedāntasūtras* or the *Brahmasūtras*

<sup>1</sup> Introduction to the Pūrvamīmāṃsā, Dr. Pashu-patinath Shastri, pp. 132-8

of Bādarāyaṇa were composed. Modern Indian scholars are inclined to assign as early a date as the sixth century B C, while others would prefer to fix the date between 100 B C and 200 A D<sup>1</sup>

The *Vedāntasūtras* contain four chapters. The first discusses the Brahman as the Ultimate Reality. The second deals with objections raised by rival schools of philosophy. The third proposes to study the means of attaining Brahmanvidyā, while the fourth discusses the results of Brahmanvidyā. The *Vedāntasūtras* are in intimate agreement with the teachings of the Upanisads. As such Bādarāyaṇa has evinced his great and abiding reverence for the Vedas. Unlike the Sāṅkhya, the Vedānta

The  
Vedānta  
sūtras

<sup>1</sup> The orthodox Indian tradition makes the author identical with Vyāsa, the author of the *Mahābhārata*. Śaṅkarācārya however does not clearly state anywhere that Vyāsa (or Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana, born as an incarnation of the Vedic sage Apīntaratamaḥ by the direction of Lord Viṣṇu) was the author of the *Brahmasūtras*. He calls this author invariably as Bādarāyaṇa and never as Vyāsa and does not explicitly say that the two are identical. But Vīcaspati, Ānandagiri, Rāmānuja, Madhva, Vallabha and Baladeva identify Bādarāyaṇa with Vyāsa.

of Bādarāyana champions the cause of monism when he holds that it is the One Brahman which is the Transcendent Reality. Bādarāyana openly refutes the Sāṅkhya doctrine which conceives Puruṣa and Prakṛti as two independent entities. The conception of Māyā as the illusory principle which shuts out the vision of the Brahman and reflects *It* as many, is a great contribution to the philosophical thought of the world. The world exists so long as the vision of the Brahman does not dawn upon us. While the Sāṅkhya maintains that the world is an evolution (*parivāma*) of Prakṛti, the Vedānta holds that the world is an appearance (*vivarta*) of the Brahman.

Early  
teachers of  
Vedānta

Among the early teachers of Vedānta mention must be made of Gaudapāda who in his famous *Kārikās* has made a systematic treatment of the monistic Vedānta. Another important author is Bhāṭṛhari (probably belonging to the first part of the seventh century A.D.) who is said to have written a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*. Yet another author hinted at by Śaṅkara is Bhāṭṛprapañca according to whom the Brahman is at once, one and dual. Besides him Śaṅkara speaks of one

Vṛttikāra, who remains even now unidentified<sup>1</sup>

The greatest of all thinkers on monistic Vedānta is Sankara who, according to Professor Max Muller and other modern scholars, wrote his immortal *Saṃśārabhaṣya* during 788 A D — 820 A D. The orthodox tradition, however, assigns him to the latter half of the seventh century A D (686 A D — 720 A D). Besides the philosophical insight which marks his writings, his style and diction have always lent a unique distinction to them. Sankara has written commentaries on the ten major Upaniṣads and his commentary on the *Bṛhadāraṇyakaopaniṣad* has, in particular, attracted the attention of many an able thinker. Sankara's expositions have earned for him a distinction which may be described in this way that by the expression Vedānta we seem invariably to understand his views on it.

The *Saṃśārabhaṣya* was commented upon by two schools of thought known as

<sup>1</sup> Whether he is the same as Upavarṣa a brother of Varṣa the teacher of Pīṇini or Bodhīyana or whether the two sages are identical or whether there was a third author who passed as Vṛttikāra cannot be definitely ascertained

Vivarana  
school

the Vivarana school and the Bhāmatī school. The original source of the former school is found in the *Pañcapādikā* of Padmapāda who is said to have composed the commentary on the *first five quarters* (pādas) of the *Brahmasūtra-sāṁkhya* of which only the commentary on the *first four Sūtras* are now available. The age of Padmapāda is about the end of the seventh and the beginning of the eighth century A D, as he is represented as the senior-most disciple of Śaṅkara. The *Vivarana* which is a gloss on the *Pañcapādikā*, was composed by Prakāśātman (probably, ninth century A D, 1200 A D according to Professor Radhakrishnan). According to him the Brahman is both the content (*viśaya*) and the locus (*āśraya*) of Māyā Vidyāraṇya who is generally identified with Mādhava (fourteenth century A D), wrote a summary on the *Vivarana* known as the *Vivaranapramēyasamgraha*.

Bhāmatī  
school

The Bhāmatī school has been well represented in the *Bhāmatī* of Vācaspati, the *Kalpataru* and the *Śāstradarpana* of Amalananda (thirteenth century A D) and the *Parimala* of Appayyadīkṣita (sixteenth-seventeenth century A D.)

The literature on monistic Vedānta, as



interpreted by Śaṅkara, is extremely rich. Suresvara (who is traditionally identified with Maṇḍana who later became a disciple of Śaṅkara), wrote his *Taittirīyopaniṣad bhāṣyavarttika*, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka bhāṣyavarttika* and *Naiṣarmyasiddhi* about the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century A.D.<sup>1</sup> Maṇḍana's *Brahmasiddhi* is an outstanding work in which he puts forward many original ideas. The *Samhśepasāraṇa* was written in verse by Saṅkṣātmamuni in the ninth century A.D. The *Iśasiddhi* of Avimuktātman (or Vimuktātman) is another notable work of the school. In 1190 A.D. Śrī Harsa who is noted for his trenchant logic and Advaita polemics, composed his *Khandanaśhandalādhya*—a masterly contribution. In the thirteenth century A.D. Citsukha wrote on the same lines his *Pratyakṣatattvapradīpika* or *Citsulhi*. In the fourteenth century A.D. Vidyāraṇya wrote his *Pañcadāśī*, a highly popular work in verse and the *Jñānmulāvivēka* a work of considerable importance. Vidyāraṇya and his teacher Bhāratīnātha jointly wrote the

<sup>1</sup> Some would rather place him in the first half of the ninth century A.D.

*Vaiyāsikanyāyamālā*. The *Vedāntasāra* of Sadānanda, is a good manual of monistic Vedānta. It was composed in the fifteenth century A.D. Another epistemological manual on monistic Vedānta is the *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* which was composed by Dharmatājādharmaśrī in the sixteenth century A.D. His son Rāmakṛṣṇa (sixteenth-seventeenth century A.D.) wrote the commentary *Śikhāmanī* on it. Ānandagiri's *Nyāyanūnaya* (fourteenth century A.D.) and Govindānanda's *Ratnaparibhāṣā* (fifteenth century A.D.) are two other commentaries on Śaṅkara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*. Prakāśānanda's *Siddhāntamuktāvalī* (fifteenth century A.D.) and Appayadīksita's *Nyāyarahsāmanī* and *Siddhāntaleśasamgraha* are other valuable manuals of the monistic school. Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, a Bengali of the sixteenth century A.D., wrote his monumental work the *Advaitasiddhi* which contains an intricate and abstruse criticism of the rival school of Madhva as represented in the *Nyāyamṛta* of Vyāsārītha or Vyāsārāja (last part of the fifteenth century A.D.). The *Gaudabrahmānandī* or *Laghucandrikā* of Brahmanānda, is a defence of the *Advaitasiddhi* against the criticism of Rāmācārya

(alias Rāmātirtha or Vyāsarama) in his *Taranginī* (latter part of the sixteenth century A D)

The *Brahmasutras* of Bādarāyana have been differently interpreted by a number of great thinkers of different schools, all of whom wrote their works after Sāṅkhya. One such thinker was Bhāskara who wrote his *Bhaṣya* sometime about the end of the eighth or the first part of the ninth century A D. Bhāskara was a champion of the doctrine of the simultaneous identity and difference (Bhedābhedaśāstra).

Schools of  
Vedānta  
(i) Bhāskara

Ramanuja is another great commentator on the *Brahmasutras* whose age is assigned to the eleventh century A D. His philosophy is based on the doctrine of qualified monism (Viśiṣṭadvaitaśāstra) according to which God is the one Reality, but is a composite of the conscious individual selves and the non-conscious material world. Rāmānuja's chief sources of inspiration were the Tamil Gāthās of the Ālvaras or Vaiṣṇava saints of South India, the chief of them being Nāthamuni and Yāmunācārya (tenth century A D). The name of his commentary is the *Sribhaṣya*. The *Srutapraśaṅga*

(ii) Rama  
nuja

of Sudarśana (thirteenth century A.D.) is a well-known gloss on the *Śrībhāṣya*. Venkatanātha Vedāntadeśika (thirteenth century A.D.) was perhaps the greatest successor of Rāmānuja. He was the author of the *Śata-dūsanī*, the *Tattvātīkā* (a commentary on the *Śrībhāṣya*) and the *Seṣcaramīmāṃsā*.

(iii) Nimbārka

Nimbārka is another commentator on the *Brahmasūtras*. His commentary is called the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*. He advocates the doctrine of dualistic non-dualism (Dvaitādvaitavāda) which is somewhat akin to the view of Bhāskara with but minor technical differences. Nimbārka lived about the eleventh century A.D. His disciple Śrīnivāsācārya wrote a commentary known as the *Vedāntakaustubha*. Keśavakāśmīn, a follower of this school (fifteenth century A.D.), wrote a commentary on the *Gītā* known as the *Tattvaparikāśikā*.

(iv) Madhva

One more commentator on the *Brahmasūtras* is Madhva who was born in 1199 A.D. Besides the commentary he wrote, he justified his interpretation in another work called the *Anuvyākhyāna*. He advocates the theory of pure dualism (Dvaitavāda).

Yet another commentator is Vallabha who lived in the last part of the fifteenth

century and the first part of the sixteenth century A D His commentary is called the *Anubhasya* The theory he advocates is pure non dualism (Suddhadvaitavāda) He looks upon the world as a reality which is in its subtlest form the Brahman

Last, though not the least, is the school of the Gaudīya Vaiṣṇavas who advocate the doctrine of insciutable identity and difference (v) Gaudīya (Acintyābhedābhedavāda) Though they call themselves a branch of the Mādhva school yet in views they are more akin to the school of Nimbārka and sometimes follow Sankara also The school traces its origin to the teachings of Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya who flourished in Bengal in the sixteenth century A D In the Gaudīya Vaiṣṇava school, Rūpa gosvāmī a contemporary and disciple of Śrī Caitanya, was a great versatile scholar who wrote many works on drama, rhetoric and philosophy His *Vaiṣṇavatoṣaṇi*, a commentary on the tenth chapter of the *Bhagavata*, is an important contribution to the literature of the Gaudīya Vaiṣṇavas His nephew and disciple Jivagosvāmī also was a great scholar and a prolific writer His six *Sandarbhās* (*Kṛāmasandarbhā*, *Tattvasandarbhā*, *Bhaktisandarbhā*, etc.) and

the *Sarvasamvādinī* are outstanding works on Gaudīya Vaiṣṇava philosophy. Baladeva Vidyābhūṣana (eighteenth century A.D.) wrote the *Govindabhāṣya*, the commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*, written according to the Gaudīya Vaiṣṇava point of view. His *Pramāṇaratnāvalī* is also a popular work.

## B

## HETERODOX SYSTEMS

I  
Buddhism  
  
Introduc-  
tion

The Buddhists are the followers of Gotama Buddha who preached his doctrines in the language of the people sometime in the sixth and the fifth centuries B.C. The Buddhist Canonical literature or the *Tīpitaka* which was written in Pāli, has three divisions (1) the *Vinayapitaka*, (2) the *Suttapitaka* and (3) the *Abhidhammapitaka*. Besides the Canonical works, the Buddhist literature possesses a rich number of non-Canonical works which were also written in Pāli. It must be mentioned here that the Buddhist literature has a still wider scope and it includes fairly a long list of Sanskrit works an account of which has already been set forth in a previous chapter.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Chap V, pp 51-75

Four  
schools of  
Buddhism

The Buddhist philosophers are broadly divided into the *four* schools—the Sautian tīkas, the Vaibhāsikas, the Mādhyamikas and the Yogācāras. Like Jainism, Buddhism also does not accept the authority of the Vedas. The Buddhists acknowledge only *two* means of knowledge—perception and inference. Though there are sharp lines of demarcation among the *four* schools referred to above, they are unanimous in their attitude against Brāhmanic culture. I tsing, the Chinese traveller, says—Those who worship the Bodhisattvas and read the Mahāyanasūtras are the Mahāyanists and those who do not perform such acts, are the Hīnayānists. The Mahāyanists are divided into *two* branches—(1) Mādhyamika and (2) Yogācāra. The Hīnayānists also have *two* divisions—(1) Vaibhāsika and (2) Sautrantika. Both are called Sarvastivādins.

The Vaibhāsikas reject the authority of the Sūtras and attach themselves to the *Vibhāṣa*, the commentary on the *Abhidharma*. Kātyāyanīputra's *Jñānaprasthāna* (composed about three hundred years after Buddha's Nirvana) is their chief work. The commentary *Mahāvibhāṣa* was compiled by five hundred Arhats led by Vasumitra, pro

(1) Vaibha  
śika

bably after the great council under Kaniska. Fragments of *Udānavagga*, *Dhammapada*, *Ekottarāgama*, Aśvaghoṣa's *Buddhacarita* and Āiśaśūra's *Jātakamālā* seem to belong to this school Bhadanta (third century A D) Dharmatrāta and Ghosaka are other prominent exponents of this school

(ii) Sautrāntika

According to Hiuen Tsang (Yuan Chwang) Kumāralāta (or Kumāralabdha), a contemporary of Nāgārjuna, was the founder of the Sautrāntika school The Sautrāntikas derive their name from the fact that they take their stand on the Sūtras To be precise, unlike the Vaibhāṣikas, they adhere to the *Suttapitaka*, (the section consisting of the discourses of Lord Buddha) to the rejection of the two other Piṭakas It is unfortunate that all works of this school are no longer extant Dharmottara, the logician, and Yaśomitra, the author of the commentary on Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa*, are said to be the followers of this school

(iii) Mādhyamika

The founder of the Mādhyamika school was Nāgārjuna who is said to have written the *Śatasāhasaśīlā-prajñāpāramitā*, the latest of the Mahāyānasūtras It may be mentioned in this connection that the *Prajñāpāramitās* declare that the highest wisdom consists of



the knowledge of Void (*Sunyata*). The most representative work of the Mādhyamika school is the *Madhyamikalālaṅkāra* or the *Madhyamikalāsūtra* of Nāgārjuna which consists of four hundred verses in twenty seven chapters. Nāgārjuna wrote a commentary of his own work which is named the *Abhutobhaya*. Unfortunately the work has not come down to us in Sanskrit. Among other works written by Nāgārjuna are the *Yuktisāhita*, the *Sunyata saptaṭī*, the *Pratītyasamutpādaḥdaya*, the *Mahayanavimśāla* and the *Vigrahavyākaraṇa*. Nāgārjuna is usually placed between the first century B.C. (according to the tradition preserved in the archives of the Dalai Lama) and the fourth century A.D. (according to Dr. S. C. Vidyābhāṣaṇa). In any case he cannot be later than 401 A.D. when Kumārajīva translated his life into Chinese. Śāntideva (seventh century A.D.), the author of the *Bodhicaryavatara* and the *Śālistasamuccaya* is named sometimes as a Mādhyamika and sometimes as an advocate of the Yogācāra doctrine. The commentary named the *Prasannapada*, written by Candrakīrti in the sixth or the seventh century A.D., is an important contribution to the Mādhyamika literature. Āryadeva who

is a disciple of Nāgārjuna, wrote the *Catūṣ-  
ṣataka* which is another important work of  
the Mādhyamika school. It was commented  
on by Candrakīrti. Other works by Āryadeva  
are the *Cittavṛśuddhiprakāraṇa*, the *Hasta-  
vālaprakāraṇa* and two other small treatises  
constituting a kind of commentary on some  
sections of the *Lankāvatāra*.

(iv) Yogā-  
cāra

The founder of the Yogācāra school was  
Maitreyanātha, the teacher of Asanga who  
is generally believed to have clearly expressed  
the implications of his system. Asanga is  
at least as late as the third century A.D.,  
though some would place him in the fourth  
or the fifth century A.D. According to the  
Yogācāra school nothing exists beyond  
consciousness (*vijñāna*). The *Abhisamayā-  
lankārakārikās* and probably the text of the  
*Mahāyānasūtrālankāra* attributed by Pro-  
fessor Lévi to Asanga and the *Yogācāra-  
bhūmiśāstra*, a prose work after the  
manner of the *Abhidharma* text, are the  
works of Maitreyanātha<sup>1</sup>. Aśvaghoṣa

<sup>1</sup> The name of Asanga has become more famous  
than that of his teacher Maitreyanātha. This explains  
why the works of the latter are attributed to the  
former. According to the Tibetans and Hsien Tsang  
the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* has been ascribed to Asanga.

was a follower of the Yogācāra school who wrote among other works the *Mahayanasaddhotpadasutra* is detailed in a previous chapter.<sup>1</sup> Vasubandhu Asanga is a great name in Buddhist literature who is assigned to the fourth century A.D., though some place him in the fifth century A.D. His work the *Abhidharmalosa* in six hundred verses which has not reached us in the Sanskrit original is a lasting contribution to Buddhist philosophy. In this work the author has refuted chiefly the views of the Vaiśeṣikas. The Sāṅkhya theory has been criticized in his *Paramarthaśaptati*. Yasa-mitra wrote a commentary on the *Abhidharmalosa* known as the *Abhidharmalosa vyākhyā* the earliest translation of which into Chinese was done in the sixth century A.D. The work is highly important as it enables us to know the views of the Vāibhāsikas and the Sautrāntikas. Vasubandhu wrote his monumental treatise the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi* consisting of two works the *Vimśatikā* and the *Triṃśikā* which explain the doctrine of the reality of consciousness. A few other works viz., *Pañcaśāndhaparīkṣā*, the *Vyākhyāyul* ti

<sup>1</sup> Ch V p 66

the *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa* and two commentaries on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra* and the *Pratītyasamutpādasūtra*, the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and the *Aparīmitāyussūtrōpadeśa* are said to have been written by Vasubandhu. Among the adherents to the school of Vasubandhu mention must be made of Sthūnamati, Dignāga, Dharmapāla and Śīlabhadra. Sthūnamati wrote a commentary on Vasubandhu's *Trisāṅkā-Vijñapti* while Dharmapāla had a commentary on the *Vimśatikā-Vijñapti*. Dignāga was the disciple of Vasubandhu, brother of Ārya Asaṅga. Dignāga's date also is not accurately fixed. Thus while some assign him to the fifth century A.D., others place him between 520 A.D. and 600 A.D., and make him a contemporary of Gunaprabhā, the teacher of King Śī-Haṁsa of Kanauj. Mallinātha, the famous commentator of the fifteenth century A.D., seems to find a reference to this Dignāga in Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*. Dignāga's *Prāmāṇasamuccaya*, *Prāmāṇasāstīapraśaṅga* and other works are preserved in Tibetan translations, and are very popular in Japan. The only Sanskrit work of Dignāga which has recently come down to us is the *Nyāyapraśaṅga*. Dharmakīrti (sixth or

seventh century A.D.) wrote a valuable work the *Nyayabindu* which was commented on by Dharmottara (ninth century A.D.) in his *Nyayabinduṭīḥa*. Śīlabhadra (seventh century A.D.) was the head of the Buddhist Vihara at Nālandā and Yuan Chwang (Hiuen Tsang) acquired from him his knowledge of Buddhist philosophy. Sāntarasiṭha in the eighth century A.D. wrote a voluminous work, the *Tattvasamgraha*, in which he has criticized the views of many rival schools of philosophers. His work was commented on by Kamalasila in his *Pañcika*<sup>1</sup>.

The Jains are the followers of Jina which is a title applied to Vardhamāna the last prophet. Vardhamāna said that he was the expounder of tenets that had been successively held by *twenty three* earlier sages. The Jains are divided into *two* schools: (1) Śvetāmbara (white robed) and (2) the Digambara (sly robed or nude). We are told that this division took place as early as the first century A.D. The

II  
Jainism

Two schools

<sup>1</sup> A late treatise on the Buddhist philosophy is the work of Advayaśra who is assigned to the close of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century

Śvetāmbara Jainas possess both Canonical and philosophical works, while the Digāmbara Jainas have no Canonical literature. The Canonical literature of the Śvetāmbara sect comprises *eighty-four* books among which *forty-one* are Sūtras. Both the schools disregard the authority of the Veda and are, therefore, called heterodox schools of philosophy by the orthodox Hindu philosophers.

The earliest Digāmbara author who is also held in high esteem by the Śvetāmbara sect, is Kundakunda whose works are all written in Prākṛit. The first known Digāmbara writer in Sanskrit, is Umāsvāmin, also called Umāsvāti (third century A D) whose *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* (in ten chapters) is regarded as an authoritative text by both sects. Siddhasena Divākara is also a well-known Digāmbara philosopher who wrote probably in the fifth century A D. His commentary on the *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* and his two other works the *Nyāyāvātāna* and the *Sammatīrṇakasūtra* are all important contributions. In the first half of the eighth century A D, Samantabhadra, a Digāmbara, wrote a commentary on the *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* which contains an

introduction called the *Āptamīmamsa* which was known both to Kumāṇila and Vācaspati Śūnratibhadra's other works are *Yūtya nuśasana* and *Ratnakarandaśrīvalacūra*. To the same century in all probability lived Akalanka among whose works the *Tattvartharajavarttika* and the *Aślasatī* commentaries on the *Tattvarthadhigamasūtra* and the *Āptamīmamsa* respectively, may be mentioned. His views were strongly opposed by Kumāṇila. It was Vidyānanda who defended Akalanka against the criticisms of Kumāṇila by writing the *Aślasahasrī*, the *Tattvarthasālovararttika*, the *Āptaparīkṣa*, the *Patraparīkṣa*, the *Prāmanaparīkṣa* and the *Prāmanamūrtinaya*. Māṇikyānandin wrote his *Parīkṣamūlhasūtra* which is based on the *Nyayavimścaya* of Akalanka. Prabhācandra who is said to be a pupil of Kundakunda wrote two independent works on logic, the *Prāmeyakamalamartanda* and the *Nyayakumudacandrodaya*. It is usually believed that Prabhācandra was a pupil of Akalanka, but it is stated in the epilogue of the *Prāmeyakamalamartanda* that the work was composed during the reign of Bhoja of Dhāra. Subhacandra is another Digambara Jain who wrote his

*Jñānānava*, a philosophical work in verse, at the close of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century A D

(11) Svetām-  
bara

Haribhadra is the earliest Śvetāmbara Jain philosopher who wrote two important works, the *Saddarśanasamuccaya* and the *Lokatattvanirṇaya*, besides a commentary on the *Nyāyapraveśa* of Dignāga, the *Yogadrśisamuccaya*, the *Yogabindu* and the *Dharmabindu*. His date is believed to be the ninth century A D. Towards the close of the ninth century A D Amṛtacandra wrote the *Tattvārthasāra* and the *Puruṣārthasiddhyupāya* besides a few commentaries. Hemacandra is a great Jain philosopher whose *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā* is an important work on Jain philosophy. Malliseṇa in the thirteenth century A D wrote his *Syādvādamāñjarī*, a commentary on Hemacandra's *Anyayogavyavacchedikā*. To the same century belongs Āśādharā among whose works mention should be made of the *Dharmāmṛta*. Devendrasūri, another writer of the same century, wrote the *Siddhapapañcāśikā*, the *Vandānūrtti* and the *Upamatiḥvavapapañcā-kathā-sāroddhāra*. In the fifteenth century Sakalakṛti wrote a voluminous work the *Tattvārthasāradīpaka* in twelve



chapters To the same century belonged Sruṭasagara who wrote the *Jinendriya-jayāvidhi* and the *Tattvārthadīpikā* In the seventeenth century flourished Yaśovijaya who wrote the *Jñānabīndupīṭhārāṇa* and the *Jñānasara*

The substance of the doctrine of the Indian materialists is aptly and very briefly summed up in the allegorical drama, the *Prabodhacandrodaya*—‘Lokāyata is the only Sāstīa In this system perceptual evidence is the only authority The elements are four in number—earth, water, fire and wind Wealth and enjoyment are the objects of human existence Matter can think there is no other world Death is the end of all ‘Lokāyata (directed to the world of enjoyment through senses) is the Sanskrit expression for materialism It is the name of the Sāstīa The materialists are called Lokāyatikas or Cārvākas called as such after the name of the founder of the school

Cārvāka's story is found in the *Mahābhārata* while the doctrine is referred to in the *Mahābhārata* (*Sātyaparin* and *Santi parvan*), the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and the *Manu smṛti*, as that of the Nihilists and the

III  
Materialism  
(Cārvāka)

Introduc-  
tion

References  
to Cārvāka  
philosophy

Heretics Sometimes Cārvāka is identified with Br̥haspati, who incarnated himself as an atheist in order to bring ruin unto the demons. The classic authority on the materialist theory is said to be the *Sūtras* of Br̥haspati, which have perished. The *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* of Mādhava gives a summary of the teaching of the school in its first chapter. Fragmentary quotations of *Sūtras* and passages from works of the school now lost to us, can be traced in the polemical works of other philosophical schools.

Early  
teachers

Among the earlier heretical teachers, mention may be made of Sañjaya the sceptic, Ajita Keśakambalin the materialist, Purāṇa Kāśyapa the indifferentist, Maskarin Gosāla the fatalist and Kakuda Kātyāyana the elementalist.

Schools of  
Materialism

The materialists, again, were subdivided into several schools: those who identified the body with the self, those who confused the self with the external senses, those who regarded the internal organ (*antahkaraṇa*) as their self and so on. The oft-quoted verses quoted by Mādhava, give a popular view of the materialists. "While the life remains, let a man live happily, let him feed on

ghee, even if he runs in debt when once the body becomes ashes, how can it ever return again? The three authors of the Vedas were the hypocrites, knaves and night prowlers etc etc

(

### MISCELLANEOUS WORKS ON PHILOSOPHY

*Śrīkaṇṭhabhāṣya* is a commentary on the *Brahmīsūtra* by Śrīkaṇṭha alias Nilakāṇṭha (thirteenth or fourteenth century A.D.)—written from the Viśiṣṭa Advaita point of view—much in the same line as that adopted by Rāmānuja—commented on by Appayya-dīkṣita in his *Śrīarṇavamānīpīṭika*. (It is said that Appayya was at first a Śaivite and later was converted into an Advaitin.)

*Śrīśārābhāṣya* is a commentary on the *Brahmīsūtra* by Śrīpati Pandita representing the Dvaitādvaita point of view.

*Commentaries on the Gītā* (named *Subodhinī*) the *Bhāgavata* and the *Vīṣṇupurāṇa* by Śrīdharaśāstrī (twelfth or thirteenth century A.D.)—who is claimed to be an exponent of the Suddhādvaita school inasmuch as he refers to

Viṣṇusvāmin the founder of the Śuddhādvaita school in the commentary on the *Bhāṣya* [Vallabhācārya (fifteenth-sixteenth century A D) was a later exponent of this school. But as he has also referred to Citsukha, it may also be possible that he was a thinker of the Advaita school, who was rather inclined to the doctrine of Devotion (*Bhakti*). This sort of compromise between the doctrines of Devotion (*Bhakti*) and Knowledge (*Jñāna*) is also found later in the *Bhaktirasūyana* of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī who was a sturdy champion of the Advaita philosophy]

*Sarvadarśana-  
saṃgraha*

by Mādhavācārya who along with his brother Sāyana, the celebrated commentator of Vedic literature, was in the court of Kings Harihara and Vira Bukka of Vijayanagara (fourteenth century A D) and subsequently turned a Sannyāsin and passed his days in the Śringerī Matha. A valuable encyclopaedia of Indian philosophy, which contains the summary of the views of at least *seventeen* different orthodox and heterodox schools of Indian philosophy

*Sarvasiddhānta sārasaṅgraha* ascribed to Śaṅkarācārya but seems to be the work of a more modern hand who was possibly one of the later chiefs of the Śaṅkara Maṭha—a work in the line of the *Sarvādarsanaśaṅgraha* though written in easy verses

*Vijñānāmṛtabhāṣya* by Vijñānabhikṣu (sixteenth century A D) who by writing this commentary on the *Brahmasūtras* tried to make in the body of this work a sort of compromise between the Sūkhya and Yoga views on one hand and the Vedāntic (Upaniadic) views on the other

*Saktibhāṣya* by Pañcīnana Tarkatarka of the twentieth century A D—an ingenious work in the form of a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*. It does not however strictly conform to the orthodox Śaktīgama standpoint

#### REFERENCES

- Das Gupta S N History of Indian Philosophy  
Vols I II & III
- Keith A B A History of Sanskrit Literature
- Radhakrishnan S Indian Philosophy Vols I  
& II
- Winternitz M A History of Indian Literature Vol II



## APPENDIX

### HISTORY OF THE STUDY OF SANSKRIT IN THE WEST

It was in the seventeenth century that the European people particularly missionaries and travellers came to know of the Indian languages. In 1651 A D Abraham Rozer published a Portugese translation of Bhartihari's poems. In 1699 A D the Jesuit Father Johann Ernst Hanxleden came to India and after getting himself acquainted with the Sanskrit language wrote the first Sanskrit grammar in a European language. The book however was not printed but was consulted by Fra Paolino de St Bartholomeo who wrote two Sanskrit grammars besides a number of important works. It was during the administration of Warren Hasting that the work called *Vividānavasetu* was compiled. Under the title *A Code of Gentoo Law* it was published in English in 1776 A D. Nine years later the *Bhagavadgītā* was translated into English by Charles Wilkins who also rendered into English the *Hutopadesa* and the *Sakuntala* episode of the *Mahābhārata*. It was however Sir William Jones who did most to arouse the interest of Europeans in Indian literature. In 1789 A D he published his English translation of Kālidāsa's *Sakuntala* and this was followed by his translation of the *Manusmṛiti* the most important legal literature of ancient India. It was again through his enthusiasm that the *Rtusamhāra* of Kālidāsa was published in the original text in 1792 A D. The English translation of Kālidāsa's works by Sir William Jones was followed by the German translation of *Sakuntala* by Georg Forster in 1791 which attracted the attention of men like Herder and Goethe. The work of Jones was followed up by Henry Thomas Colebrooke who

published 'A Digest of Hindu Law on Contracts and Successions' based on a composition in Sanskrit by orthodox Indian scholars. He also edited a number of Sanskrit works including the *Amarakośa*, the *Astādhyāyī*, the *Hitopadeśa* and the *Kaūtūjanīya*. Another Englishman who studied Sanskrit in India was Alexander Hamilton who, while returning to England in 1802 A.D., was imprisoned with other Englishmen at Paris under orders of Napoleon Bonaparte. During the period of his imprisonment Hamilton trained up a band of European scholars who took to the study of Sanskrit with earnest zeal. This is commonly referred to as the 'Discovery of Sanskrit' in the West. One of Hamilton's most distinguished students was the great German scholar and poet Friedrich Schlegel, who wrote that epoch-making work 'On the Language and Wisdom of the Indians'. This work introduced for the first time the comparative and the historical method. It also contained translations in German of many passages from the *Rāmāyana*, the *Bhagavadgītā*, the *Manusmṛiti* and other early works. Friedrich Schlegel's brother August Wilhelm von Schlegel, student of Professor A. L. Chezy, the first French scholar in Sanskrit, not only contributed much to the study of Comparative Philology but also helped the study of Sanskrit by editing texts and writing translations. One of Schlegel's students was Christian Lassen who was deeply interested in Indian culture. The science of Comparative Philology was founded by Franz Bopp, a student of Professor Chézy and contemporary of August Wilhelm. Bopp also rendered great service to the investigation of Sanskrit literature by incorporating in his work "Conjugations-System" translations from the *Rāmāyana* and the *Mahābhārata*. His Sanskrit Grammars considerably furthered the study of Sanskrit in Germany. The work of Bopp in the domain of Comparative Philology was developed in a most comprehensive manner by Wilhelm von Humboldt whose interest in the philosophical works of the



Indians was of an abiding character. Another noted German Friedrich Buckert was also highly interested in Indian poetry. The Latin translations of the Upaniads in the beginning of the nineteenth century inspired German philosophers. Schelling, Kant, Schiller and Schopenhauer were highly charmed to discover the production of the highest human wisdom. The actual investigation of Vedic literature was first undertaken by Friedrich Rosen in 1838 and was subsequently continued by a band of illustrious students of the great French Orientalist Eugene Burnouf including Rudolf Roth and F. Max Muller who brought out his famous *editio princeps* of the *Rgveda* with the commentary of Sîyana in the years 1849-70. One of Roth's distinguished students was H. Grassmann who published a complete translation of the *Rgveda*. It was during this period that Horace Hayman Wilson who came to Calcutta represented the orthodox interpretation of the *Rgveda* by translating it on the lines of Sîyana's commentary. Similar work was done by Alfred Ludwig who is looked upon as a forerunner of R. Pischel and K. F. Geldner the joint authors of *Vedic Studies*. The name of Theodor Aufrecht is also associated with Vedic investigations.

The publication of the great St. Petersburg Dictionary (Sanskrit Wörterbuch) in 1802 is an important event in the history of progressive studies in Sanskrit in the West. The Dictionary was compiled by Otto Bohtlingk and Rudolf Roth and published by the Academy of Fine Arts and Sciences St. Petersburg. The *History of Indian Literature* which was published by Albrecht Weber in 1802 A.D. and was edited for the second time in 1876 A.D. is another important work. The edition of the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* by the same author is another outstanding contribution. The *Catalogus Catalogorum* published by Theodor Aufrecht in the years 1891, 1896 and 1906 forms a most comprehensive list of Sanskrit authors and works and is a monumental work of its kind.

Arthur Anthony Macdonell's 'Vedic Grammar' and 'Vedic Mythology' and the 'Vedic Index' by Macdonell and Arthur Berniedals Keith, have all proved helpful works for the study of Sanskrit in Europe. Maurice Bloomfield's 'Vedic Concordance' is another great work which has been of immense help to Vedic studies in the West. William Dwight Whitney's 'Sanskrit Grammar' is yet another important treatise. Edward Byles Cowell, who was Principal, Government Sanskrit College, Calcutta, gave a distinct fillip to Sanskrit studies by his translations of the *Sarva-darśanasamgraha* and many other important Sanskrit works. Arthur Venis, Principal, Government Sanskrit College, Benares, also did a lot to help Sanskrit studies. Amongst European scholars who lived in India and took interest in Sanskrit learning and literature, mention may be made of J. F. Fleet, Vincent A. Smith, Sir Alexander Cunningham, Sir John H. Marshall, Sir M. A. Stein, Sir George Grierson and J. Fergusson.

Among later European scholars who have done invaluable service to the cause of Sanskrit studies the names of George Buhler, J. Mun, Frank Kielhorn, E. Roer, H. Luders, Hermann Jacobi, E. Senart, Sylvain Lévi, Edward Washburn Hopkins, E. Hultzsch, Arthur Coke Bunnell, Monier Williams, Theodor Goldstucker, Richard Garbe, Paul Deussen, Julius Eggeling, George Thibaut, Julius Jolly, and Maurice Winternitz are remembered by all lovers of Sanskrit.

Of living western indologists, the more important names include F. W. Thomas, A. B. Keith, L. D. Barnett, T. Tscherbatsky, Sten Konow, Vallee Poussin, Otto Strauss, C. R. Lanman and Giuseppe Tucci.

# INDEX

- Abhayanandin 100  
 Abhidhūnacintamanī 171  
 Abhidhanaratnamālā 171  
 Abhidharmakośa 71 224 226 7  
 Abhidharmakośa aṅga 227  
 Abhidhāṛṣṭimātīlā 160  
 Abhiyānasaluntala 97 108  
 Abhinanda son of Jayanta 80  
 Abhinanda son of Śātinanda 86  
 Abhinavabhāratī 163 160  
 Abhinavagupta 46 70n 161  
 163 160 167  
 Abhinayadarpana 193  
 Abhisamayālaṅkārahārī 71  
 226  
 Abhiseka 102  
 Acintyabhedābheda-vāda 221  
 adbhuta 70n  
 Adbhutadarpana 117  
 Adbhutasagara 191n  
 Adipurāṇa 85  
 Advaitasiddhi 218  
 Advaya-vijaya 229n  
 Ādya Śakti 43  
 Agastimata 193  
 Agnipurāṇa 42 161n 171 173  
 Āṭṭhābhūṇya-samhita 46  
 Aihole inscription 91  
 Aiyer G 53  
 Āṇḍa ke akambalin 234  
 Akalanika 231  
 Ākhyāyikā 136 7  
 Āl obhyāyāṇa 69  
 Āl utobhaya 70 225  
 Āl bāṇi 32n 189  
 Alexander 89  
 Alankāra 154 161 2 66  
 Alanlāṇa-undā 81  
 Alankārasaṅgraha 161  
 Alankārasarāsa 167  
 Alankāraśekhara 169  
 Ālola 198  
 Āl iras 319  
 Amalīnanda 217  
 Amara-candra 87 168  
 Amarakośa 173 n  
 Amaramangala 117  
 Amarasūtra 136 173 74  
 Amaru 123  
 Amaru ataka 123  
 Āmitagatī 127  
 Amoghāṛṣṭi 100  
 Āmṭabhāratī 107  
 Āmṭacandra 232  
 Āmṭamanthana 80  
 Āmṭinanda 61  
 Ānandabhāratī 46  
 Ānandagiri 213n 219  
 Ānandalaharī 127  
 Ānanda-vardhana 83 111 124  
 126 7 161 164 60 167  
 Ānandaharī 1 Mitra-vijaya 114  
 Ānangarāṇa 183  
 Ānanta 147  
 Ānargha-ighara 112  
 Ānārthasamgraha 174  
 Ānārthasamuccaya 174  
 Ānārddha Pitrāyikā 178  
 Ānārddha Com on Sūkhya  
 sūtra 201  
 Ānka 97 102  
 Ānāmbhatta 201  
 Ānubhāṇya 221  
 Ānubhūti-svarūpācārya 156  
 Ānubhūti-śāstra 220  
 Ānubhūti-śāstra 232

- Anyoktīmuktātalaśataka*, 127  
*Apāntaratamas*, 213n  
*Aparimitāyussūtopadeśa*, 226  
*Āpastamba*, 175  
*Āpiśali*, 147  
*Āpoḍeva*, 211  
*Appayyadīkṣita*, 169, 211, 216, 218, 235  
*Āptamīmāṃsa*, 231  
*Āptapañikṣa*, 231  
*Ārambhavāda*, 202  
*Āśimha*, 133, 168  
*Ārjunarūpanīya* 85  
*Ārjunavarman*, 124  
*Ārthasamgraha*, 211  
*Ārthasūtra*, 99, 143, 180  
*Ārya Asanga*, 71, 226, 226n, 228  
*Āryabhata*, 188-9  
*Āryabhata, Āryasiddhānta*, 188  
*Āryabhāṭya*, 188  
*Āryadeva*, 71, 225  
*Āryāsaptatī*, 127  
*Āryasiddhānta*, 188  
*Āryāśataśata*, 188  
*Āryasūtra*, 68, 146, 224  
*Āśādhara*, 232  
*Asatkāryavāda*, 202  
*Āścarīya upapannāna*, 43  
*Āśmarathya*, 212  
*Aśoka*, 53, 74  
*Aśokavādina*, 73  
*āśrama*, 41  
*āśraṇa*, 216  
*Asṭādhyāyī*, 2, 20, 149, 149n, 150, 152-3, 158, 11  
*Asṭamāhāśrīcāryastotra*, 126  
*Asṭīṅgasamgraha*, 185  
*Asīacikitsā*, 192  
*Asṭāgṇosī*, 49, 57, 59, 60, 65, 65n, 66n, 67, 71, 77, 99, 100, 100n, 224, 226  
*Aśvarārdyaka*, 192  
*Aśvāyurveda*, 192  
*Ātharvaveda*, 33, 88, 134, 187  
*Ātmatattvaviveka*, 197  
*Ātreyā, ritual authority* 184  
*Ātreyā, authority on medicine*, 212  
*Aucilyavācāna*, 166  
*Audulomi*, 212  
*Aufrecht, T*, 111  
*Avadāna*, 65, 72-3  
*Avadānahalpalatā*, 71n  
*Avadānaśa'aka*, 73-4, 85  
*Avakṣa*, 166  
*Avimānaka*, 101  
*Avimuktātman* 217  
*Bādarāyana* 212, 213n, 214, 219  
*Bādai*, 212  
*Bāhudantiputra*, 180  
*Bālābhārata*, Amalacandha, 87  
*Bālābhārata*, Bhāṣa, 112  
*Bālācārita*, 103, 105  
*Baladeva*, 213n, 222  
*Bālamanojanmū*, 153  
*Bālārāmīyaṇa*, 112  
*Bālasubrahmanyam I R*, 78n  
*Bālbandha*, 99  
*Ballālasena*, 115  
*Bānabhatta* 34, 36, 85, 100, 109, 109n, 116, 120, 125-6, 138-9, 140-1, 146-7  
*Banerji R D*, 61n, 62n  
*Barnett, L D*, 111  
*Bauddhasamgrahyalankāra* 138  
*Bhadanta*, 224  
*Bhāṭīahalpīrādīna*, 74  
*Bhagavaṭajñānīya*, 114  
*Bhagavāṭgītā*, 1  
*Bhāṭyānata*, 42, 135, 221, 236  
*Bhakti* 169, 236  
*Bhaktirasūyana*, 236

- Bhaktisataka* 128  
*Bhallata* 127  
*Bhallatasataka* 127  
*Bhāmaha* 82 137 152 161 2  
*Bhamati* 216  
*Bhāminīlusa* 128  
*Bhāna* 97 115  
*Bhandakai R C* 61n  
*Bhanikā* 98  
*Bhānudatta* 165  
*Bhānuj* 173  
*Bharata* 17 7m 85 160 1  
163 165 168  
*Bharatacampū* 147  
*Bhāratacandra* 124  
*Bharatamañjarī* 86  
*Bhāvi* 81 83  
*Phartihari* 82 122 3 127 8  
151 154 214 1  
*Bhartimentha* 84  
*Bhartimitra* 208  
*Bhartiprapaṇca* 214  
*Bhisa* 97 99 100 1  
*Bhaṣapariṣheda* 201  
*Bhāsarvajña* 197  
*Bhāṣaṣṭi* 158  
*Bhāṣāra upapurāṇa* 43  
*Bhāṣaka Unmattavaghaṇa* 117  
*Bhāṣaka philosopher* 219 20  
*Bhāskarīcarya* 189  
*Bhaṣati* 189  
*Bhaṣa Bhāṣaka* 219  
*Bhāṣacintamani* 211  
*Bhāṣadīpika* 211  
*Bhāṣanīyana* 111 2  
*Bhāṣāyaka* 164  
*Bhāṣanahasya* 211  
*Bhatti* 82 85 6 137 151  
*Bhāṣikavya* 76n 81 137 157  
*Bhattop* 153 4 159  
*Bhaṭṭotpala* 190  
*Bhaumika* 85  
*Bhavabhūti* 90 92 97 109 12  
114  
*Bhavadīsa* 208  
*Bhavadēvabhāṭṭa* 177 210  
*bhāṣakāva* 164  
*Bhāṣamīsa* 156  
*Bhāṣanītha* 209  
*Bhāṣanāṣṭaka* 211  
*Bhāṣapraṣaṇa* 186  
*Bhāṣapraṣaṇa* 167  
*Bhāṣendrasūri* 87  
*bhāṣanika* 75n  
*Bhāṣabhāṣjana arman* 191n  
*Bhedaḥbhedaḥ* 219  
*Bhela* 185  
*Bhikkhupacuttīya* 3  
*Bhikkhupācuttīya* 3  
*Bhimata* 114  
*Bhūti medallion* 78n  
*Bhoja* 166 7 181 159 193  
206 207n  
*Bhojadeva* 124 231  
*bhojakutī* 164  
*Bhojaprabandha* 145  
*Bhojārīya* 147  
*Bhrgu* 176  
*bhāṣa* 75n  
*Bhāṣanīta* 189  
*Bilhan* 114 124 131  
*Bilamangala* 127  
*Bindumati* 98  
*Bloomfield M* m  
*Bodhīyan* 208 210n  
*Bodhīyanakavi* 114  
*Bodhicaryāvatāra* 225  
*Bohtlingk O* m  
*Bopp F* m  
*Brahmadatta* 56  
*Brahmagupta* 188 189  
*Brahmānanda* 224  
*Brahmanasariśva* 178  
*Brahmāṇḍapūrāṇa* 42

- Brahmapurāṇa*, 42  
*Brahmasiddhi*, 217  
*Brahmasphutasiddhānta*, 188  
*Brahmasūtra*, 135, 212, 213n,  
 214, 219-20, 222, 235  
*Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, 218  
*Brahmavairatapurāṇa*, 42  
*Bṛhacchabdendūśekhara*, 154  
*Bṛhadāraṇyakabhāṣyavūttika*,  
 217  
*Bṛhadāraṇyakopanīśad*, 215  
*Bṛhajjūtaka*, 190  
*Bṛhaspati*, 180, 234  
*Bṛhaspatismṛti*, 177  
*Bṛhadbrahmasamhitā*, 46  
*Bṛhatī*, 209  
*Bṛhatkathā*, 101, 104, 142-3  
*Bṛhatkathāmāñjarī*, 142  
*Bṛhatsamhitā*, 190, 193  
*Buddha*, 53-8, 63, 65, 195n,  
 222-4  
*Buddhabhatta*, 193  
*Buddhacarita*, 57, 60, 63, 65,  
 77, 78n, 224  
*Buddhaghosa*, 84  
*Buddhāvataṃsaka*, 70  
*Budhasvāmin*, 142  
*Buhle*, G , 1, 5, 5n, 7, 8, 122n,  
 176, iv  
*Burnell*, A C , 149n, iv  
*Burnouf*, E , iii  
*Cartanycandrodāya*, 116  
*Cartanyāmṛta*, 158  
*Cakrapāṇidatta*, 185  
*Campakaśesthikathūnaka*, 145  
*Cāṇakya*, 143, 180, 184  
*Candakauśika*, 113  
*Candēśvara*, 178, 181  
*Candī*, 42  
*Caṇḍidāsa*, 167  
*Candīśataka*, 126  
*Candia*, *Candiaka*, 114  
*Cāndia school*, 155  
*Candiagomin*, 114, 152, 154-5  
*Candiakūṭi*, 72n, 225-6  
*Candīlōka*, 168-9  
*Caraka*, 135, 181-5, 202, 207n  
*Carakasamhitā*, 181, 195n, 207n.  
*Cārūcarayāśataka*, 127  
*Cānudatta*, 101-5  
*Cānvāka*, 233-4  
*Catalogus Catalogorum*, iii  
*Caturvargacintāmanī*, 178  
*Caturvargasamgraha*, 127  
*Catuśśataka*, 71, 2-6  
*Catuśśatakatotṛa*, 67  
*Caurapañcūśikā*, 124  
*Chandomañjarī*, 172  
*Chand'o'nuśūsuna*, 172  
*Chūyū*, 206  
*Chézy*, A L , ii  
*Cidambara*, 87  
*Cikitsūkālīkā*, 186  
*Cikitsūsūtrasamgraha*, 185  
*Utrabhārata*, 115  
*Citrāmīmāṃsā*, 169  
*Citsukha*, 217, 236  
*Citsukhī*, 217  
*Cittaśuddhiprakāraṇa*, 71, 226.  
*Colebrooke*, T , 158, i  
*Conjugations-system*, iii  
*Cowell*, E B , iv  
*Cunningham*, A , 9, 10, 53, iv  
*Dalai-Lama*, 225  
*Dallana*, 185  
*Dāmodara*, 193  
*Dāmodaragupta*, 126  
*Dāmodaramiśra*, 113  
*Dandin*, 4, 9, 105n, 136-8, 142, 162-3.  
*Darpadalana*, 127  
*Daśabhūmaka*, 70  
*Daśagītīkūsūtra*, 188  
*Daśakarmapaddhati*, 178  
*Daśakumāracarita*, 105n, 137



- Ganapātha*, 155  
*Ganapati mahatmya*, 158  
*Ganḍīśotragīthā* 65  
*Gangādāsa*, 172  
*Gaṅgūlaharī*, 128  
*Gangeśa*, 197-8  
*Garbe, R.*, 196n, 203 iv  
*garbha*, 95  
*Gāngya*, 119, 203  
*Garuḍapurāṇa*, 12 193  
*Gāthā*, 51, 58, 69  
*Gāthāśaptasatī*, 120  
*Gauḍa*, 110, 130  
*Gaudabrahmānandī*, 218  
*Gaudapāda*, 203, 211  
*Gauḍapāda karikā*, 211  
*Gaudaraha*, 110, 130  
*Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava*, 221, 222  
*Gautama*, 175 195, 195n, 196, 200  
*Gayatrīśa*, 185  
*Geldner, F.*, 93, iii  
*Ghatakarpura*, 122  
*Ghatakarpurakāvya*, 122  
*Ghosaka*, 221  
*Ghosh, Anubinda*, 122n  
*Ginnār inscription*, 18  
*Gītā*, 32, 220, 235  
*Gītāgovinda*, 125 183  
*Goethe*, 106, 121, i  
*Gokulikas*, 54-5  
*Goldstuecker, T.*, 2, 119, iv  
*Gopūlacampū*, 147,  
*Gopendīa Tippa Bhūpāla* 163  
*Gopinātha*, 117  
*Gosthī*, 98  
*Govardhana*, 127  
*Govinda*, 167, 169  
*Govindabhāṣya*, 222  
*Govindānanda*, 218  
*Govindarāja*, 177  
*Grassmann, H.*, iii  
*Ghvasutia*, 174  
*Guérison, G.* iv  
*Guna*, 163.  
*Gunabhadra*, 55, 165  
*Gunīdhya*, 101, 112  
*Gunaprabha*, 228  
*Gunaratna*, 203n  
*Hala* 120, 127  
*Halayudha*, 86, 171 178  
*Hallīśa* 98  
*Hamilton, A.*, ii  
*Hammīramulamadana* 116  
*Hamsadūta*, 121n  
*Hamsasandēśa*, 121n  
*Hanumanulaka*, 113  
*Handelén J. E.*, i  
*Haradatta*, 152  
*Haradattasūtri*, 87  
*Harakalīmulaka* 115  
*Hārīvalī*, 173  
*Haravaya*, 76n 85  
*Harī*, 82, 208  
*Haribhadra*, 232  
*Haricandra*, 86 147  
*Haridikṣita*, 159  
*Harinīmāmīta*, 158  
*Hārīta*, 175  
*Harīamśa*, 32, 99, 103  
*Harīamśa*, court-epic, 87  
*Harīamśapurāṇa*, 85  
*Harīvilāsa*, 86  
*Harī*, 108-9, 109n, 140  
*Harīacarita*, 38, 109, 120 140  
*Harīadova* 127 132  
*Harīakṛti*, 191  
*Hastabīlaprakāraṇa* 226  
*Hastyāyurveda*, 192  
*hāsyā* 75n  
*Hāsyacūdāmanī*, 115  
*Hāsuśūnava*, 117  
*Hathayoga*, 207  
*Harayagīvavadha*, 84



- Hemacandīa 86 127 132 150  
 158 167 8 172 174 181  
 232  
 Hemīdī 13n 178  
 Heroic 95 110  
 Heiden 1  
 Hertel T 93n  
 Hillebrandt A 92n  
 Hinayāna 52 56 71  
 Hiranyakesin 175  
*Huopade a* 143 1 11  
 Huen Tsang 21 224 226n 229  
 Hopkins E W 36n 11  
*Horā* 190  
*Horāśastra* 190  
*Horāśatapañcīśikā* 190  
*Hṛdayadarpana* 164  
 Hultzsch E 11  
 Humboldt W von 11  
 Ibhīmiga 97 115  
 Indra 149n  
 Indradhvaja 88 91  
 Introduction to Pūrvamīmāṃsā 1  
 212n  
*Iśṭiddhi* 217  
*Īśvarākṛtsna* 106 203 205n  
*Īśvarasamhitā* 46  
 I tsing 60 151 185 225  
 Jacobi H 24 26 27n 29 35  
 36 196n 208 11  
 Jagaddeva 191n  
 Jagadīśa 198 201  
 Jagadīśvara 117  
*Jagatūcarita* 133  
 Jagannātha 128 159 161 170  
 Jaimini 208 212  
*Jaiminiyanīyamālā* 211  
*Jaina Mahābhārata* 87  
*Jaina Rāmāyana* 86  
 Jainendra 155  
 Jaiyyata 185  
 Jalhana 128  
*Jambavatīvijaya* 84  
*Jānakīharana* 82  
*Jānakīparinaya* 116  
*Jātakamālā* 68 146 224  
 Jayadatta 192  
 Jayadeva 124 5 127 183 198  
 Jayadeva Berar 115  
 Jayadeva *Candrālola* 168 9  
 Jayīditya 151 152  
*Jayamanjalā* 182  
 Jayanīrīyana 202  
 Jayanta 85 197  
 Jayaratha 167  
 Jayasimha 116  
 Jha Ganganath 208  
 Jīmūtavāhan 179  
 Jinadīśa 87  
 Jīnakūti 115  
 Jināsena *Harivamśapurana* 85  
 Jināsena *Vahīpurāna* 85  
 Jināsena *Pāñcābhyaṇḍaya* 85  
 Jinendrabuddhi 83 152 155  
*Jinendrayajñavidhi* 232  
 Jivagosvīmin 58 147 169 221  
 Jivaka 184  
*Jivandharācampū* 149  
*Jivanmūrtivīcā* 217  
*Jñāna* 236  
*Jñānabīnduprahāraṇa* 233  
*Jñānīmṛtasamhitā* 46  
*Jñānaprasthāna* 223  
*Jñānārnava* 47 232  
*Jñānasūtra* 233  
*Jñānendrasarasvatī* 153  
 Jolly J 27n 11  
 Jones W 78n 79n 125 1  
 Jumarānandin 157  
 Jyotīśvara 182  
*Jyotīśvīdyābhāṣana* 191  
*Jyotīśasāroddhāra* 191  
*Kādambarī* 138 140  
*Kādambarīkathāśara* 89

- Kaivalya*, 206  
*Kaṣyapa*, 152, 154  
*Kakudakātyāyana*, 230  
*Kalūpa*, 156  
*Kalūvilāsa*, 127  
*Kalkana*, 110, 129, 131  
*Kālidāsa*, 49, 50, 77, 77n, 80n, 81, 83-4, 97-8, 100, 105-11, 120, 122, 122n, 125, 171, 228, 1.  
*Kālikāpurāṇa*, 43  
*Kāṭvilāsa* 47  
*Kalkipurāṇa*, 43  
*Kalpadrūmāvadūnamūlū* 14  
*Kalpanūlanhṛīkū*, 65n  
*Kalpanūmanditīkū*, 65n  
*Kalpataṇu*, 216  
*Kalyānamalla*, 183  
*Kalyānamandirastotra*, 126  
*Kāmadattā*, 98  
*Kāmadhenu*, 163  
*Kamalākārabhadda*, 179 212  
*Kamalaśīla*, 222  
*Kāmandaka*, 181  
*Kāmasūtra*, 81, 182  
*Kāmsavadha*, 99  
*Kāmsavadha*, Śesakīśna, 116  
*Kanakāvatīmūdhara*, 98  
*Kaniska*, 58-9, 70, 184, 224  
*Kanabhakṣa*, 200  
*Kanabhuk*, 200  
*Kanāda*, 200-1  
*Kant*, 111  
*Kapila*, 43, 203-4  
*Kapphanūbhijudaya*, 85  
*Karanakutūhala*, 189  
*Kūṇḍavyūha*, 69  
*Kārikā*, Īśvarakīśna, 203n  
*Kārikāvalī*, 201  
*Karmaśataka*, 73  
*Karmasiddhiprakāśana*, 228  
*Karabhūra*, 102  
*Kaṇasundarī* 114  
*Karpūracarita*, 97, 115  
*Karpūramāñjarī*, 98, 113  
*karuna*, 75n  
*Kāśinājūmi*, 212  
*Kāśakītsna*, 212  
*Kāśikāṇḍavāṇanapañjilā*, 152  
*Kāśikāṇḍitī*, 82, 151-2, 210  
*Kāśyapa*, 200  
*Kāśyapasamhitā*, 193  
*Kātantrasūtra*, 156  
*Kathā*, 136  
*Kāthakasaṃhitā*, 33  
*Kāthūkaṇṭhika*, 114  
*Kāthūkośa* 145  
*Kāthūnava*, 145  
*Kāthūsaṇṭsūgarā*, 104, 106, 142  
*Kātyāyana* 20, 150  
*Kātyāyanīputra*, 223  
*Kaumāra*, 156  
*Kaumudīmītrānanda*, 115  
*Kaundabhatta*, 159  
*Kautilya*, 99, 143, 180  
*Kautukasaṃvāsa*, 117  
*Kavīkalpalatī*, 168  
*Kavīkaṇṭhūbharaṇa*, 166  
*Kavīkaṇṭhapūra* 116  
*Kavīndravacanasaṃuccaya*, 127  
*Kavīputra*, 105  
*Kavīnāhasya*, 86  
*Kavīnāja*, 85  
*Kavīśekhara*, 116  
*Kavīnāhasya*, 168  
*Kāvya*, 98  
*Kāvyaḍḍarśa*, 105, 105n, 136, 142, 162  
*Kāvyaśakalpatāṇu*, 168  
*Kāvyaśāṅkārīa* Bhāmaha, 161  
*Kāvyaśāṅkārīa*, Rudrata, 162  
*Kāvyaśāṅkārīasūtra*, 163  
*Kāvyaśāṅkārīasūtra*, 163  
*Kāvyaśāṅkārīasūtra*, 165  
*Kāvyaśāṅkārīasūtra*, 163, 167

- Kavyanusasana Hemacandra* 167  
*Kavyanusasana Vigbhata* 168  
*Kedarabhata* 179  
*Keith A B* 99 114 143 1 200  
 208 iii  
*Āeliraivataka* 98  
*Kennedy* 60n  
*Kern H* 58 9 69  
*Kesavaśāstrin* 220  
*Kesavamisra rhetorician* 169  
*Kesavamisra Nāyāyika* 201  
*Khandadeva* 211  
*Khaṇḍakhadyaka* 188  
*Khaṇḍaṇḍakhadya* 217  
*Kharaśtha* 8  
*Kharaśthi* 6 7 9  
*Kielhorn F* 122n iv  
*Kiranarali* 201  
*Kīratarjuniya court epic* 81 ii  
*Kīratarjuniya drama* 115  
*Kīrtikaumudī* 132  
*Kīrtilata* 182  
*Kokkoka* 182  
*Konow S* 60n 62n 106 109n  
 iv  
 1. *Korur theory* 60n  
*Kramadīvara* 157  
*Kṛīḍarasatā* 98  
*Kṛṣṇakarmamita* 127  
*Kṛṣṇamīśra* 113  
*Kṛṣṇananda āgamavāgīśa* 198  
*Kṛṣṇa yajurveda* 134 176  
*Kṛṣṇa yajvan* 211  
*Kṣemarāja* 46  
*Kṣemendra* 74n 84 86 115  
 127 142 166 172 182  
*Kṣemendra grammarian* 157  
*Kṣemīśvara* 113  
*Kṣīrasvamin* 173  
*Kulacudamanī* 47  
*Kulārnara* 47  
*Kulluka* 177  
*Kumārādīśa* 82  
*Kumārājīva* 225  
*Kumārālabdhā* 224  
*Kumārālitā* 65n 224  
*Kumārāsambhara* 78  
*Kumārīlabhātī* 34 38 209 10  
 212 231  
*Kundakunda* 230 1  
*Kundamala* 115  
*Kuntaka Kuntala* 166 7  
*Kuntavaradantya* 84  
*Kūrmapurāṇa* 42  
*Kuśilāra* 99  
*Kuṭṭanmata* 126  
*Kuvalayananda* 169  
*Laghu Arhamitā* 181  
*Laghucandrīla* 218  
*Laghujutaka* 190  
*Laghuśabdendu ekhara* 154  
*Laghuśiddhantakaumudī* 154  
*lakṣanī* 164  
*Lakṣanarālī* 201  
*Lakṣmanabhata* 147  
*Lakṣmīdhara* 177  
*Lalitāmudhara* 116  
*Lalitavīstara* 52 56 9 63  
*Lantuvātara* 70 226  
*Lanman C R* iv  
*Lassen C* 29 120 ii  
*Līśya* 88  
*Lālāmelālā* 110  
*Laugākṣībhīṣaka* 201 211  
*Levi S* 7 66 109n 120 184  
 206 iv  
*Līlāsuka* 127  
*Līlavatī* 189  
*Lingunusāsana* 100  
*Līngapurāṇa* 42  
*Locana* 61,  
*Locanarocanī* 169  
*Lokānanda* 114

- Lokataṭṭvanirṇaya* 232  
*Lokāyata*, 233  
*Lokeśvaratantra*, 123n  
*Lokottaravādin*, 52, 54-5, 153  
*Lolimbaiāja*, 86, 186  
*Lolkata*, 64, 163  
*Ludeis*, 11, iv  
*Ludwig*, A, iii  
*Macdonell*, A, A 120, 123n, 125, iii  
*Machiavelli* 180  
*Madūlasācampū*, 146  
*Madanapūṇṇita*, 178  
*Mādhava*, 158, 178, 204, 211, 216, 234, 236  
*Mādhavasūdhana* 117  
*Madhva*, 213n, 218, 220  
*Mādhva school*, 221  
*Mādhvakāra*, 185  
*Madhyamavyāyoga*, 97 102  
*Mādhyamika*, 71, 71n, 72, 223-6  
*Mādhyamikākārikā*, 70, 225  
*Mādhyamikasūtra*, 225  
*Madhyāntavibhāga*, 228  
*Madhyasiddhāntakaumudī*, 154  
*Madhusūdana Sarasvatī*, 218, 236  
*Māgha*, 83, 85, 152  
*Mahābhārata*, 26-7, 27n 31-6, 36n, 37, 45, 75n, 81, 83, 85, 99, 101-2, 108, 112, 134, 143, 185, 202, 205-6, 208, 213n 233, ii  
*Mahābhāṣya*, 99, 135, 152 206n, 207n  
*Mahādeva*, 117  
*Mahānūta*, 113  
*Mahānirvāna*, 47  
*Mahāvastu*, 52, 55-6, 63  
*Mahāpāsthāna*, 75n  
*Mahāpūṇṇa*, 85  
*Mahūrāja-Kaṇikalekha*, 68  
*Mahāsāṅghika*, 53-4  
*Mahāvagga*, 1  
*Mahāvamsa*, 53-4  
*Mahāvīṇācārya*, 189  
*Mahāvīṇācārita*, 86, 110  
*Mahāvīṇābhāṣā* 223  
*Mahāvīṇāstotra*, 127  
*Mahāyāna* 51-2, 56, 66, 68, 72  
*Mahāyānaśāddhotpādasūtra*, 66, 227  
*Mahāyānasūtra* 68, 70, 223-4  
*Mahāyānasūtrālanakāra*, 226, 228  
*Mahāyānavimśaka*, 70, 225  
*Mahendravikramavarman*, 97 109  
*Maheśvara-upaniṣad*, 43  
*Maheśvara*, lexicographer, 174  
*Mahimabhakta*, 166-7  
*Mahimāstotra*, 127  
*Mārttikakālyāna*, 116  
*Martīyānīya*, 176  
*Martīyanātha*, 71, 226 226n  
*Martīyarakṣita*, 158  
*Martīyasaṃiti*, 68  
*Martīyavyākaraṇa*, 68  
*Mālinīvijaya*, 46  
*Mālinīvijayottaravārttika* 46  
*Mālatīmadhava*, 97, 110  
*Mālavikā*, 97  
*Mālavikāgnimitra*, 78n 107 109  
*Mālikātmavṛta*, 116  
*Mālinātha*, 78, 152, 168, 226  
*Māliṣena*, 232  
*Mammata*, 163, 167, 169  
*Mānameyodaya*, 211  
*Mānatunga*, 125-6  
*Mānavadharmasūtra*, 175-6  
*Mandana*, 210-11, 211n, 217  
*Mānīlūkyakārikā*, 204n  
*Mānikyacandī*, 167  
*Mānikyanandin*, 231

- Mānīkyasuri 86  
 Mankba 86  
 Manu 176 7 187 202  
*Manusmṛti* 135 175 7 233  
*Manuṣyūlayacandrilā* 192  
 Maskarī Goṣṭhā 234  
*Maria Stuart* 122  
*Maṇi upapurāṇa* 43  
*Mārkaṇḍeya* 42  
 Marshall J H 60n 62n 78n  
 14  
*Matanga* 46  
*Matangalīlā* 192  
*Māticetī* 67 8  
*Mātrgupta* 84  
*Mat yapuṣāṇa* 41 193  
*Mātharaṣṭī* 203  
*Mattavilā a* 97 109  
 Max Muller F 48 53 79n  
 80n 149 210 n  
*Māyūkapiṭhīlā* 98  
*Mayamata* 192  
 May Pole 91  
*Mayūkhamālīkī* 212  
 Mayūra 123  
*Māyurīja* 114  
 Mazumdar R C 61n  
*Medhātithi* 135 177  
*Medinikīra* 174  
*Meghadūta* 79n 85 120 120  
 238  
*Meghaprabhacūya* 114  
*Menakūhita* 98  
 Merut ngā 133  
*Mīmāṃsā śāstra* 211  
*Mīmāṃsā śāstrānukramam* 211  
*Mīmāṃsāsūtrāparīkṣā* 211  
*Mīmāṃsāsūtra* 135  
*Mīmāṃsā śāstra* 177  
 Mitrāmīśra 179  
*Mohamāyā* 126  
*Moharājaparājaya* 116  
*Uccakāṭhika* 104 5  
*Uṣṇīṣaśāstra* 87  
*Uṣṇīṣa* 46  
*Uṣṇīṣaśāstra* 111  
*Uṣṇīṣaśāstra* 110  
 Mun J 14  
*Uṣṇīṣaśāstra* 107  
*Uṣṇīṣa* 95  
*Uṣṇīṣaśāstra* 162n 160  
 Murūti poet 112  
 Murūti philosopher 209  
*Uṣṇīṣa* 109  
*Uṣṇīṣa* 59 70 0n 71 71n  
 183 180 224 6  
*Uṣṇīṣaśāstra* 103 154n 159  
 206  
*Naradhacārīta* *Naradhya*  
*cārīta* 76n 83  
*Naradhyaśāstra* 217  
*Naradhya* 46  
 Nakula 192  
*Nalacampū* 146  
*Nalaparīkṣā* 193  
*Nāmaṅgānuśāsanam* 174  
 Namisīdhū 167  
 Nandana 177  
 Nandikesvara authority on  
 dancing 193  
*Nandikesvara upapurāṇa* 43  
*Naradapurāṇa* 42  
*Narad upapurāṇa* 43  
*Narada smṛti* 177  
*Narada upapurāṇa* 43  
 Nārāyaṇa *Svāhāsudhādhara*  
*campū* 147  
 Nārāyaṇa commentator on  
*Manusmṛti* 177  
 Nārāyaṇa *Maṇḍalīlā* 19  
 Nārāyaṇaśāstra *Mānameyo*  
*dāya* 211

- Nāīāyanabhatta, *Vṛttaratnā-*  
*lāra*, 172  
 Nāīāyanapandita *Navaratna-*  
*parīksā*, 193  
 Nāīāyanapandita, *Hitopadeśa*,  
 443  
 Nāīman, G K , 58  
*Naratananiraya*, 194  
 Nātaka, 95, 97-99, 102-4, 107-15  
*Nātakalaksanaratnakośa*, 168  
 Nāthamuni, 219  
 Nātikā, 98, 109, 113-4  
*Nātyadarpana*, 168  
 Nātyarāsaka, 98  
*Nātyasūtra*, 17, 78n, 88, 160,  
 165, 168, 171, 193  
*Navaratnaparīksā*, 193  
*Navasūhasānhacarita*, 130  
*Nayaviveka*, 209  
*Neminirūpa*, 87  
*neti*, 75  
*Netra*, 46  
*Nidāna*, 185  
*Nighantu*, 173  
 Nilakantha, *Tājikā*, 191  
 Nilakantha, *Śrīkanthabhāṣya*,  
 235  
*Nilamatapurāṇa*, 131  
 Nimbāika, 220-1  
*Nirbhayabhīma-vyūyoga*, 115  
*Nirayāsindhu*, 179  
*Nīratnākara*, 181  
*Nītisūtra*, 122  
*Nītirūkyāmīta*, 181  
*nirvāṇa*, 95  
*Nītyagopāla Kaviratna*, 117  
*Nyāsa*, 83, 152  
*Nyūyabhāṣya*, 196  
*Nyūyabindu*, 196-7, 229  
*Nyūyakaṇḍalī*, 201  
*Nyūyakarīkā*, 209, 28  
*Nyūyakamudacandīodaya*, 231  
*Nyūyakakusumāñjali*, 197  
*Nyūyalīlāvati*, 201  
*Nyūyamañjarī*, 197  
*Nyūyāmīta*, 218  
*Nyūyaparīkṣita*, 197  
*Nyūyapariśeṣa*, 72, 228, 232  
*Nyūyarakṣamaṇi*, 218  
*Nyūyaratnākara*, 210  
*Nyūyasūtra*, 197  
*Nyūyasucinibandha*, 197  
*Nyūyasudhā*, 210  
*Nyūyasūtra*, 135 195-6, 196n,  
 200 208  
*Nyūyasūtravṛtti*, 199  
*Nyūyasūtroddhāra*, 197  
*Nyūyatūtpariyālikā*, 196  
*Nyūyāratā*, 230  
*Nyūyaviniścaya*, 231  
*Nyūyavṛttika*, 196-7  
*Nyūyavṛttikatūtpariyāpari-*  
*śuddhi*, 197  
 Oldenberg, H , 93, 146, 36n, 61n  
*Padamañjarī*, 152  
*Padānkhadūta*, 121n -  
*Padārthadharmasamgraha*, 200  
*Padārthakhandana*, 198  
*Padmanābha*, 157  
*Padmapāda*, 216  
*Padmapurāṇa*, court-epic, 85  
*Padmapurāṇa*, 42, 108  
*Padyacūḍāmaṇi*, 85  
*Paksadharmamīśa*, 198  
*Pūlakūpya*, 192  
*Pañcadaśī*, 217  
*Pañcānana Tākaratna*, 117, 237  
*Pañcasūyaka*, 182  
*Pañcasādhūntikā*, 187-8  
*Pañcasākhya*, 203  
*Pañcaskandhaprakāśana*, 227  
*Pañcarūpa*, 103  
*Pañcatantā*, 21, 143  
*Pāṇḍavacarita*, 87

- Pandavapurana* 87  
*Pāṇini* 2 17 19 20 1 34 57  
 84 99 149 149n 150 215n  
*Paolino F* 1  
*Paramalaghumañjuṣa* 154n  
*Paramārtha* 203n  
*Paramurthasaptatī* 71 227  
*Paramārthasāra* 46  
*Paramasaṃhitā* 46  
*Parāśara* 43  
*Parasāramadhara* 178  
*Parasarasamṛti* 178  
*Paribhasendusekhara* 154  
*Paribhasasūtras* 100  
*Paribhasavṛtti* 158  
*Parikṣamukhasūtra* 231  
*Parimāla* 130  
*Parimāla* 216  
*parināma* 214  
*Parīśataparian* 86 132  
*Parśvabhyudaya* 80  
*Parśvanāthacārīta* 87  
*Parthaparākrama* 110  
*Parthasarathimīra* 200 1  
*Paratīparinaya* 116  
*Pasakakevali* 191n  
*Pasupati* 178  
*Patulavijaya* 84  
*Patañjali grammarian* 16 7 20  
 34 135 148 149n 150 2  
 207n  
*Patanjali Yogasūtra* 200 207n  
*Pathaka* 150  
*Pathetic* 110  
*Patiparīkṣā* 231  
*Pauṣṭarasamhitā* 46  
*Parāṇāuta* 120  
*Peterson P* 78n 79n  
*Phuyau king* 58  
*Pingala* 171  
*Pischel R* 81 89n 91 92n 93  
 105n 108 125 111  
*Pitṛdayita* 178  
*Prabandhacintamani* 133  
*Prabandhakosa* 133  
*Prabhacandra* 132 231  
*Prabhakara* 209 212  
*Prabhūrahacarita* 132  
*Prabodhacandrodaya* 113 233  
*Prabuldharaśūhineya* 115  
*Pradīpa* 152 154  
*Pradyumnasuri* 132  
*Prahasana* 97 109 114 7  
*Prahladanadeva* 115  
*Prajñūdanda* 71  
*Prajñāpīramitā* 70 224  
*Prakarana* 97 104 106 110 1  
 110 6  
*Prālaranapañcika* 209  
*Prakaramukha* 98  
*Prakāśananda* 218  
*Prakāśitman* 216  
*Prakāśanāṇḍa* 81  
*Prakṛta paṅgala* 171  
*Prakṛtyakāumudī* 153  
*Pramānamumamsa* 232  
*Pramānanirṇaya* 231  
*Pramānaparīkṣā* 231  
*Pramānapīravesa* 228  
*Pramānasamuccaya* 72 228  
*Prameyāmalamartanala* 231  
*Prameyāratanāraṇa* 222  
*Pratāpini* 47  
*Prapañcasara* 47  
*Prasāda* 153  
*Prasannakanala* 81  
*Prasannapada* 225  
*Prasannaraghava* 115  
*Prasthāna* 89  
*Pratāparudrayasobhāna* 164  
*Pratiharenduraja* 162n  
*Pratyjñayaugandharayana* 199  
*Pratimā* 102  
*pratimulha* 95

- Pratinayaka, 89  
*Pratītyasamutpāṣaṇīdaya*, 70,  
 225, 228  
 Pratyabhijñā, 16  
*Pratyabhijñāhīdaya*, 46  
*Pratyabhijñāhīkā*, 46  
*Pratyabhijñāvimarsinī*, 46  
*Pratyaktattvapradīpikā*, 217  
*Pratīthamananam*, 153, 159  
*Pratīthamananamūlucamardini*  
 59  
 Pravasasena, 137  
*Prāyaścittavivaraṇa*, 177  
 Pienkhanaka, 98  
*Priyadarśikā*, 109  
*Priyamvadā*, 128  
*Pithuśas*, 190  
*Pithvidhara*, 156  
*Pithirājaviṇaya*, 112  
 Puṇyāṇḍa, 157  
 Purāṇa Kāśyapa, 234  
*Pūrvamegha*, 121  
*Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra*, 206, 214  
*Pūrvapīthikā*, 138  
*Puru apārīkṣā*, 145  
*Puruṣārthasiddhyupāya*, 232  
 Puruṣottama, 174  
 Puruṣottamadeva, 158  
 Puspadanta, 127  
 Puspamitra, Pusyamitra, 73, 78n,  
 150  
 Quietistic, 95, 113  
 Rabindranath, 121  
 Radhakrishnan, S 5, 196n, 210,  
 216  
*Rājavibhāṣa*, 193  
*Rāghavanāśa bhīya*, 87  
*Rāghavananda*, 177  
*Rāghavapīṭhavalīya*, 85  
*Rāghavapīṭhavalīyanāśadhīya*,  
 87  
 Raghunandana, 43n, 178  
 Raghunatha, 196  
 Raghunātha Śrīnomaṇi, 198  
*Rāghuśaśa*, 78n, 80  
*Rāvatamudanikā*, 98  
*Rājamūrtanī*, 206, 207n  
*Rājaśekhara*, 82, 81-5, 92  
 98 100, 112-3  
*Rājaśekhara*, 14th century,  
 133, 165  
 Rājayoga, 207  
*Rājataranginī*, 106 110, 129,  
 131, 137  
*Rājanīhāṇapāṭra*, 132  
*Rāmabhadra*, 115.  
*Rāmadikṣita*, 116-7  
*Rāmacandra*, *Kṛmudīmūtrā-*  
*nanda*, 115  
*Rāmacandra*, *Nibhayabhīma-*  
*vyāyoga*, 115  
*Rāmacandra*, *Bhaktiśataka*, 128.  
*Rāmacandra*, *Prakṛtyūkaumudī*,  
 153  
*Rāmācārita*, 86,  
*Rāmācārya*, 219  
*Rāmākṣita*, 218  
*Rāmākṣitabhāṭya*, 211  
*Rāmaśaśaśa*, 191n  
*Rāmānuja*, 33, 213n, 219, 220,  
 235  
*Rāmāpīṭhacārita*, 131  
*Rāma Tarkavāgīśa*, 157  
*Rāmānītha*, 219  
*Rāmāyana*, 21, 23-6, 27n, 28,  
 28n, 29, 30-1, 35-7, 43, 82,  
 85, 99, 101 2, 110, 113,  
 115, 11  
*Rāmāyanaśāstra*, 147  
*Rāmāyanaśāstra*, 86  
 Rapson, E J, 61n  
 Rasa, 75, 161-4, 166 9  
*Rasajāṅgadhara*, 170



- Risaka 98  
 Rasamañjari 168  
 Rasaratnakara 180  
 Rasatarangini 168  
 Rasavati 157  
 Rasikañjana 87  
 Ra trapila 70  
 Ratamañjari 183  
 Ratirahasya 182  
 Ratisastha 183  
 Ratnikara 85  
 Ratnakaranāṣṭrakacura 231  
 Ratnaparikā 193  
 Ratnakuta 70  
 Ratnavadanamala 74  
 Ratnaprabhu 212  
 Ratnavali 97 109 109n 114  
 raudra 70n  
 Ratanurjuniya 85  
 Ratanaśadha 81 82  
 Ravigēna 85  
 Raychaudhuri H 62n  
 Rgveda 29 88 92 107 114  
 187 iii  
 Rjuvimala 209  
 Rtusamhara 122 i  
 Ridgeway 91  
 Riti 88 161 3  
 Roer J 15  
 Rosen F iii  
 Roth R iii  
 Roy S 78n  
 Rozer A i  
 Rucaka 167  
 Ruckert F iii  
 Rudradaman 48  
 Rudrata 162  
 Rudrabhaṭṭa 144  
 Rudrayamala 46  
 Rul munharana 97 115  
 Rupagosvamin 58 116 121n  
 169 221  
 Rupaka 97  
 Ruyyika 86 167  
 Śabarabhaṭṭa 208 9  
 Śabarasiuamin 135 203 208 9  
 Śabdakalpadruma 13n 174  
 Śabdakaustubha 103  
 Śabdanuśasana Hemacandra  
 106  
 Śabdanuśasana Śikṣiṇya 100  
 Śabdanuśasanabṛhadīṭṭi 106  
 Śabdaratna 109  
 Śabharvacandrika 100  
 Śabdasātiprakāśika 191  
 Sadānandī 218  
 Sadāśiva 192  
 Sādīharmapūjarika 69  
 Sāldarśanasamuccaya 232  
 Sādhanā 206  
 Sādūktikarmamṛta 127  
 Sāgaranandin 168  
 Sāhityādarpana 97 116 160  
 Sakalakīrti 87 232  
 Śikṣiṇya 149 105  
 śakti 164  
 Śaluntala 78n 79n 90 107 8 i  
 Śahotra 192  
 Śālikanītha 209  
 Samādhi 206  
 Samādhirāja 70  
 Samantabhadra 230 i  
 Samarāṅganasūtradhara 193  
 Samavakīra 97 103 115  
 Samaveda 88  
 Samayamatṛka 127  
 Samba 43  
 Sambhu 127 132

- Samhitā, 44-6  
*Samjñātanta*, 191  
*Samksepaśūtrika*, 217  
*Samksiptasūtra*, 157  
*Samlāpaka*, 98  
*Sammatītanakasūtra*, 230  
*Samskārapaddhati*, 177  
 Sanskrit Grammar, 11  
*Samudramanthana*, 97, 115  
*Samudratilaka*, 191n  
*Samvāda* hymn, 92-3, 107  
*Samyaktvamuktivali*, 145  
*Sanatkumāra*, 43  
*Sandarbhāsa*, 221  
*sandhi*, 76, 95  
*Sandhyākāśanandin*, 131  
*Saṅgītadarpana*, 193  
*Saṅgītamakaraṇḍa*, 193  
*Saṅgītanāṭnākara*, 193  
*Saṅgītasūtrasāra*, 195  
*Sañjaya*, 234  
*Śaṅkaracetovilāsacampū*, 147  
*Śaṅkara*, 38, 126-7, 135, 210, 213n, 214-5, 217-9, 221, 237  
*Śaṅkara, Upaskāra*, 201  
*Śaṅkha*dhara Kaviṇāja, 115  
*Sāṅkhya*, 41, 71  
*Sāṅkhyakārikā*, 203-4  
*Sāṅkhyaparavacanabhūṣya*, 204  
*Sāṅkhyaparavacanasūtra*, 204  
*Sāṅkhyasūtra*, 204  
*Sāṅkhyasūtravṛtti*, 204  
*Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī*, 204  
*Sāṅkhyayanaśrautasūtra*, 33  
*Sanmukhakalpa*, 193  
*śānta*, 75n  
*Śāntaraksita*, 229  
*Śāntideva*, 72n, 225  
*Śāntiparvan*, 233  
*Śāntiśataka*, 128  
*Saptapadārthi*, 201  
*Śatapathcūṣatikānāmastotra*, 67  
*Saptaśatī*, 42  
*Śrīadūtanaya*, 167  
*Śrīadūtilaka*, 47  
*arānadeva*, 158  
*Śrīasvataparakṛiṣṭā*, 156-57  
*Śrīasvatikānthābhāṣana*, 166  
*saṅga*, 76  
*Śrīiputraprakāśana*, 66, 100  
*Śrīinākabhāṣya*, 215-16  
*Śārmisthīyayātri*, 97  
*Śāṅgadatta*, 192  
*Śāṅgadeva*, 193  
*Śāṅgadharma*, 128  
*Śāṅgadharapaddhati*, 128  
*Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, 204, 234, 1v  
*Sarvajñāmṛta*, 126  
*Sarvajñātmamuni*, 217.  
*Sarvānanda*, 133, 173  
*Sarvasamvādinī*, 222  
*Sarvasiddhāntasamgraha*, 237  
*Sarvāstivādin*, 52, 56-7, 67, 71  
*Sarvavaiśman*, 156  
*Sasthītanta*, 203  
*Śāstradarpana*, 216  
*Śāstrādīpikā*, 211  
*Śāstrin*, Haraprasad, 62, 65, 79n, 91  
*Śāstrin*, Pashupatinath, 212n  
*Śāstrin*, T. Ganapati, 100  
*Śūśvata*, 174  
*Śatadūsanī*, 220  
*Śataka*, 122  
*Śatapathabhāṣmana*, 187, 111

- Satānanda 86 199  
*Satasūhasrī aprajñāpāramitā* 224  
 Sātavāhana 120  
 Sātkīryavāda 04  
*Satruñjaya māhātmya* 86  
 Sattaka 98 113  
*Sattasā* 120 127  
*Sāttvatasamhitā* 46  
 Sauddhodanā 169  
*Saugandhīlāharaṇa* 116  
 Saumilla 105  
*Saundarananda* 65 77  
*Saundaryalaharī* 126  
 Saurasenī 91  
*Sautrāntika* 223 4 227  
*Sāyana* 158 iii  
 Schiller 122 iii  
 Schlegel F 27n ii  
 Schlegel A W von ii  
 Schopenhauer iii  
 Schroeder L von 93 122n 125  
 Senaka 149  
 Senart F 51 iv  
 Śeṣakṛṣṇa 116  
*Seṣa amīmāṃsā* 220  
*Setubandha* 137  
*Sevyaśeṣa* 127  
*Shadow Sūtrī* 92  
 Siddha 145  
*Siddhāntaśaṣṭī* 153 54  
*Siddhāntaśeṣa* 218  
*Siddhāntamuktāvalī* 218  
*Siddhāntapañcāśikā* 232  
*Siddhāntasiroṃhaṇī* 189  
*Siddhasena Divākara* 126 230  
 Śīlāhāmanī 218  
*Śikṣasamuccaya* 225  
 Śilabhadra 228 29  
 Śīlābhāṭṭīkī 128  
 Śīlāhāna 198  
 Śilpaka 98  
 Śilparatna 193  
*Śimhāsanadīpāṇṣikā* 144  
 Śirādeva 158  
*Śirī Pulamṭyī* 49  
*Śisupālārādha* 83  
*Śiṣyadharmādharma* 189  
 Śītābenā 89  
 Śivādāsa 144 145  
 Śivadatta 106  
*Śivadharmā* 43  
 Śivāditya 201  
*Śivadr̥ṣṭi* 46  
*Śivapurāṇa* 42  
*Śivārhamanīpikā* 235  
 Śivasvīmīn 85  
 Śkandagupta 77  
*Śkandapurāṇa* 38 42 108  
*Ślokaśaṃgraha* 142  
*Ślokaśāntī* 210  
 Smith V A 5 6 41 53 59  
 60n 62n iv  
*Smṛtikalpataru* 177  
*Smṛtiratnākara* 178  
 Soddhala 147  
 Somadeva 142 146 155 181  
 Somānanda 46  
 Somañītha 193 211  
 Somaprabha 128  
 Somesvarabhaṭṭa 210  
 Somesvaradatta 132  
*Sphoṭasiddhi* 211n  
 Sphoṭāyana 149  
*Sragdharāstotra* 126  
*Srautasūtras* 175  
*Śrībhāṣya* 219 220

Śīcantanya, 198.  
 Śīdhana, 127, 167, 201  
 Śīdhanasena, 82  
 Śīdhanasvāmin, 235  
 Śīgadita, 98  
 Śīhaisa, 83, 98, 217, 228  
 Śīhastamuktāvalī, 194  
 Śīkantha, 235  
 Śīkanthabhūṣya, 235  
 Śīkanthacarita, 86  
 Śīkarabhūṣya, 235  
 Śīkṣṇacaitanya, 221  
 Śīkumāra, 193  
 Śīnivāsācārya, 220  
 Śīpati Pandita, 235  
 Śīśankuka, 163  
 Śīvaia, 128, 144  
 Śīvatsa, 201  
 Śīngūra, 75n  
 Śīngūraprakāśa, 166  
 Śīngūraśataka, 122  
 Śīngūratilaka, 98, 125  
 Śīngūraavanūgyatāṅginī, 128  
 Śīrutabodha, 171  
 Śīrutaprakāśikā, 219  
 Śīrutasāgara, 233  
 Stern, M., iv  
 Sthāpaka, 92  
 Sthūnamatī, 72, 288  
 St Petersburg Dictionary, iii  
 Strauss, O., iv, iii  
 Sæali, 169n  
 Subandhu, 34, 39, 46, 138  
 Śubhacandīa, 87, 231

Subhāṣitamuktāvalī, 128  
 Subhāṣitāatnasandoha, 127  
 Subhāṣitāvalī, 128.  
 Subodhinī, 235  
 Sūcaritamīśa, 210  
 Subhata, 116  
 Sudarśana, 193, 220  
 Śuddhādvaita, 236  
 Śuddhādvaitavāda, 231  
 Śūdraka, 105, 105n, 10  
 Sūhillekha, 71n  
 Śukasaptatī, 144  
 Sūkhavātīvyūha, 69  
 Śūkranīti, 181  
 Sūktasankīrtana, 133  
 Sūlapāni, 178  
 Śungas, 107, 176  
 Sūnya, 196n  
 Śūnyatā, 225  
 Śūnyatāsaptatī, 70, 225  
 Supadma, 157  
 Supadmapañjikā, 157  
 Suparūdhyūya, 93n  
 Suprabhātastotra, 126  
 Sunathotsava, 132  
 Suresvara, 211, 217  
 Sūryaśataka, 123, 123n  
 Sūrya-upapurāna, 43  
 Suśrūta, 135, 184-5  
 Sūtradhāra, 92  
 Sūtrāṅkūṭa, 65, 68  
 Suvarṇabhūṣa, 70  
 Sūtratīlaka, 172  
 Svachanda, 46  
 Svāhāsudhākarācampnī, 147  
 Svapnadaśanana, 114  
 Svapnavāsavadattā, 103-4.  
 Svāyambhuva, 46

- Svetamvara 229 30 232  
*Taittiriyaṛanyaka* 187  
*Taittiriyaśaṃhita* 148n 187  
*Taittiriyaopaniṣadbhāṣya*  
     *vārttika* 217  
*Tajika* 191  
*Takakusu* 71 203n  
*Tamil Gāthā* 219  
*Tāndava* 88  
*Tautatitamatatilaḥa* 177 210  
*Tantra* 44 5 190  
*Tantralola* 46  
*Tantrakhyaṇika* 143  
*Tantrarāja* 47  
*Tantrasāra* 46 7 198  
*Tantravarttika* 260  
*Tāpasavatsarajacarita* 114  
*Tarālā* 168  
*Tārinītha* 67  
*Tārinātha Vacaspatya* 174  
*Tarangin* 219  
*Tarkabhāṣā* 201  
*Tarkamṛta* 201  
*Tarakaumudī* 201  
*Tarkasamgraha* 201  
*Tārakaraṇa* 201  
*Tattvabodhin* 153  
*Tattvacintamani* 198  
*Tattvacintāmanivyākhyā* 198  
*Tattvadīpikā* 233  
*Tattvaprahāṣikā* 220  
*Tattvārthadhigamasūtra* 220 21  
*Tattvārthadīpala* 202  
*Tattvārthadīpika* 233  
*Tattvārtharajavarttika* 231  
*Tattvārthasāra* 232  
*Tattvārthaslokovarttika* 231  
*Tattvasamgraha* 229  
*Tattvasamgrahapañcī* 229  
*Tattvavāṇika* 220  
*Tattvavaiśaraḍī* 206  
*Tattvavyākhyā* 198  
*Taylor I* 8  
*Thera* 54  
*Thibaut G* iv  
*Thomas F W* 60n 61n 68n  
     iv  
*Tilakamañjari* 147  
*Tinantalānīḥa* 81  
*Tipiṭṭala* 3 28 34 67 67n  
     222  
*Tisata* 186  
*Tithitattva* 179  
*Trikanāśa* 174  
*Trimsikā* 227 28  
*Tripuradīha* 97 110  
*Triśaṭsalakapuruṣacarita* 56  
*Trisati* 189  
*Trivikramabhāṭṭa* 146  
*Trotaka* 98 107  
*Tscherbatsky T* iv  
*Tucci G* iv  
*Tuphka* 210  
*Ucchusmabhairava* 46  
*Udattarūghava* 114  
*Udānaragga* 224  
*Udayana* 197 98 201  
*Udayasundarikathā* 147  
*Udbhaṭa* 161 162 162n 167  
*Uddandin* 116  
*Uddyota* 104  
*Uddyotakara* 138 196 97 200  
*Uddahatattva* 178  
*Ujjvalamāmani* 169  
*Ullīpya* 98  
*Uluka* 203  
*Umāsvīmin* 230  
*Umāsvīti* 230  
*Umbeka* 210  
*Unādisūtras* 155  
*Unmattaraghava* 117  
*Upakramaparākrama* 211

- Upamitibhavarapañcū-kathā*,  
 145  
*Upamitibhavarapañcū-kathā-*  
*sūnoddhāra* 232  
*Upaṇiṣad*, 135  
*Upaiṭṭipaka*, 97  
*Upaskāra*, 201  
*Upavāsa*, 208, 215n  
*Uṇubhanga* 102  
*Uśanas-upapinnāna*, 180  
*Utpala*, 46  
*utsūha*, 112  
*Utsistikāṅka* 97  
*Uttarapinnāna*, 85  
*Uttarāṇumacārīta*, 90, 92, 111  
*Vācaspati*, 179, 197, 201 206  
 209, 211, 213n 216, 231  
*Vācaspatya*, 174  
*Vādināja*, 86  
*Vāgbhata*, epic-poet 87  
*Vāgbhata*, rhetorician, 168  
*Vāgbhata*, rhetorician 168  
*Vāgbhata*, medical authority 185  
*Vāgbhatūlankāra*, 168  
*Vaibhāsika*, 223-4, 227  
*Vaidarbha*, 49, 110, 138  
*Vaidyajiṇa*, 186  
*Vaijyanti*, 174  
*Vaikhāṇasadharmasūtra* 175  
*Vairūḍhīyasūtra*, 56-7  
*Vaiśeṣikaśataka* 123  
*Vaiśeṣikasūtra*, 200, 201  
*Vaiśnavadharmasūtra*, 175  
*Vaiśnavatoṣṇī*, 221,  
*Vaiyūkananabhūṣana*, 159  
*Vaiyūkananabhūṣanasāra*, 159  
*Vaiyūkananāsiddhāntamañjūsā*,  
 154  
*Vaiyāsikanyūyanvīlā*, 218  
*Vājradatta*, 123n  
*Vajrasūci*, 67  
*Vākpati*, 110, 130  
*Vakrokti*, 166  
*Vakroktijīvita*, 166  
*Vākyapadīya*, 123n. 151, 155.  
*Valabhi*, 82  
*Vālūadha*, 98  
*Vallabha*, *Nyāyalīlāvatī*, 201  
*Vallabha*, *Suddhādvaita*, 213n,  
 220, 236  
*Vallee Poussin*, 57 11  
*Vālmiki*, 23, 26, 28, 36, 81  
*Vāmana*, rhetorician, 82, 105n,  
 111, 123, 164  
*Vāmana*, grammarian, 151-2  
*Vāmana-pinnāna*, 42  
*Vāmana Bhatta Bāna*, 116  
*Vandānīyīti*, 232  
*Vaiśadāyja*, grammarian, 154  
*Vaiśadāyja*, *Tālikakāśā*, 201  
*Vaiśhamibha*, 187, 190  
*Vaiśha-pinnāna*, 42  
*Vaiśvadevya*, 84  
*Vaiśvaci*, 171  
*Vaidhamāna*, *Kāntia-se'ool*,  
 156  
*Vaidhamāna Ganaratnamaho-*  
*dadhi*, 158  
*Vaidhamāna Yogamañjari*, 192.  
*Vaidhamāna Naiyāyika*, 198.  
*Vaidhamāna*, Jīna, 229  
*Vaiśvayūrahasya*, 47  
*Vaiśa*, 215n  
*Vāsaganya*, 203, 203n  
*Vaiśatanīa*, 191  
*Vāttikābhāraṇa* 210  
*Vāttikakāra*, 150  
*Vāttikas*, 150, 155  
*Vaiśvadevya-upapinnāna*, 43.  
*Vāsavadattā*, 138-9  
*Vaśistha* 1 175  
*vastu*, 75  
*Vāstuvidyā*, 192



- Viṣṇupurāṇa* 41-2, 134,  
 233, 236  
*Viṣṇuśaṁman*, 143  
*Viṣṇusvāmin*, 236  
*Viśva-karmaprahāśa*, 193  
*Viśvanātha*, rhetorician, 97, 116  
 167, 169  
*Viśvanātha*, philosopher, 199, 201  
*Viśvaprahāśa*, 174  
*Viśvaiūpa*, 211  
*Viśveśvara*, 178  
*Vitarāgastotra*, 127  
*Vithi*, 97  
*Vitthalācārya*, 153  
*Vivādacintāmaṇi*, 179  
*Vivādanānūkāra*, 178  
*Vivādanarasetu* 1  
*Vivaraṇa*, 216  
*Vivaraṇanāpīrameyasamgraha*, 216  
*Vivaraṇa school*, 216  
*vivarta*, 214  
*Vivṛti*, 202  
*Void*, 225  
*Vopadeva*, 157-8  
*Vratāvadānamūlū*, 74  
*Vṛddhagaṇgasamhitā*, 190  
*Vṛddhāvāsisṭhasamhitā*, 191  
*Vṛndāvanastuti*, 127  
*Vṛttaratnākara*, Kedāra, 172  
*Vṛttaratnākara*, Nārāyaṇa, 172  
*Vṛtti*, Kūśikū 152  
*Vṛtti*, Dugasiṁha, 156  
*Vṛtti*, quoted by Śābara, 208  
*Vṛttikāra*, 208, 215  
*Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya*, 148, 151  
*Vyākhyāyuktī*, 227  
*Vyaktivveka*, 166  
*vyañjanā*, 164  
*Vyūptipañcaka*, 199  
*Vyāsa*, 38, 206, 208, 219n  
*Vyāsabhāṣya*, 206  
*Vyāsarāja*, 218  
*Vyāsaśāma*, 219  
*Vyāsatīrtha*, 218,  
*Vyavahāracintāmaṇi*, 179  
*Vyāyoga*, 97, 102, 115-6  
*Vyomaśekhara*, 201  
*Vyomaśivācārya*, 201  
*Vyomavatī*, 201  
*Weber*, A A, 8, 28, 28n, 29,  
 89n, 109n, 149, 187  
*Whitney*, W D 111  
*Wilkins*, C 1  
*Wilson*, H H, 111  
*Winternitz*, M, 26-8, 31, 36,  
 42, 36n 65n 66n 109n, 114  
*Windisch*, E, 89  
*Wogihara*, 71  
*Wonderful*, 110  
*Yādava*, 174  
*Yādavodaya*, 98  
*Yājñavalkya*, 178  
*Yājñaralkhyasmiti*, 177-78  
*Yajurveda*, 33, 88  
*Yamakas*, 122  
*Yāmunācārya*, 219  
*Yaśahpāla*, 116  
*Yaśaścandra*, 115  
*Yaśastilaka*, 147, 181  
*Yāska*, 19, 20, 173.  
*Yaśodhara*, 182  
*Yaśodharacarita*, 86,  
*Yaśodharacarita*, 86  
*Yaśomītra*, 72n, 224, 227  
*Yaśovijaya*, 233  
*Yātiā*, 125, 125n  
*Yavanajūtaka*, 190  
*Yavanikū*, 89, 90  
*Yoga*, 41, 154  
*Yogabindu*, 232  
*Yogācāra*, 71, 223, 225-7  
*Yogācārabhūmisūtra*, 71, 226,  
 226n



<i>Yogadrśhisamuccaya</i>	232	<i>Yogatattvika</i>	206.
<i>Yogamañjarī</i>	192	<i>Yuan Chwang</i>	224 229
<i>Yogasūtra</i>	127	<i>Yuktādīpikā</i>	204
<i>Yogasarasamgraha</i>	206	<i>Yuktikalpataru</i>	181 193
<i>Yogaśāstra</i>	127	<i>Yuktisa (ib.)</i>	70 220 •
<i>Yogasūtra</i>	200 6 206n 207n	<i>Yuktisnehaprapūṇī</i>	211
	209	<i>Yuktyanusāsana</i>	231